



Daily Report

Central Eurasia

FBIS-SOV-93-081
Thursday
29 April 1993

Daily Report

Central Eurasia

FBIS-SOV-93-081

CONTENTS

29 April 1993

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

INTERREGIONAL AFFAIRS

CIS Leaders Conclude Meeting in Minsk 28 Apr	1
Economic Coordination Council Planned [ITAR-TASS]	1
New Body To Meet Monthly [BELINFORM]	1
Some Refuse To Sign Documents [BELINFORM]	1
Conference 'Unexpectedly Delayed' [Moscow Radio]	1
Chernomyrdin 'Delighted' at Results [ITAR-TASS]	1
Kebich, Chernomyrdin Comment [ITAR-TASS]	2
Further on Kebich, Chernomyrdin [Minsk Radio]	2
'Great Advance' Noted [ITAR-TASS]	2
Ukraine on Economic Committee [Radio Rossii]	3
Venue for 26 May Summit Viewed [ITAR-TASS]	3
Commander Says All Russian Aircraft Removed From Baltics [Riga Radio]	3

RUSSIA INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Kozyrev Interviewed on Yugoslav Situation [Russian TV]	4
Further on Kozyrev Comments [IZVESTIYA 29 Apr]	5
Khasbulatov Alleges Clinton-Yeltsin Deal on FRY [Belgrade TANJUG]	6
Units Train in Chechnya To Protect Bosnia Muslims [NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 28 Apr]	7
Balkan Intervention Said Threatening Americans in Russia [NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 28 Apr]	7
Churkin Not Optimistic About Bosnian Situation [Belgrade BORBA 27 Apr]	7
PRAVDA Article Criticizes West's 'Biased Approach' to Bosnia [28 Apr]	8
Panetta Cited on Obstacles to Aid for Russia [IZVESTIYA 29 Apr]	9
Norway's Holst Opens Consulate General in St. Petersburg [Oslo AFTENPOSTEN 21 Apr]	10
Goes to Arkhangelsk Conference [Oslo AFTENPOSTEN 22 Apr]	11
Negotiator Views Latvia-Russian Talks [NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 28 Apr]	11
Japan Plans To Move Consulate From Nakhodka to Vladivostok [Vladivostok Radio]	12
Shokhin, Gerashchenko Attend London EBRD Talks [IZVESTIYA 29 Apr]	12

RUSSIA NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political Issues

Presidential Council Meets in Kremlin 28 Apr [ITAR-TASS]	14
Rutskoy Stripped of Duties [Moscow Radio]	14
Referendum, Rutskoy Discussed [Moscow TV]	14
Yeltsin Satisfied With Referendum [Moscow International]	15
Yeltsin Meets With Expanded Session of Government	15
Session Previewed [ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 27 Apr]	15
Yeltsin Presents Constitution [ITAR-TASS]	15
Calls For Examination of Constitution [Moscow Radio]	16
Seeks Contributions to Constitution [ITAR-TASS]	16
Calls For Continued Economic Reform [Moscow TV]	17
Addresses Meeting [Russian TV]	17
Chernomyrdin Addresses Meeting [ITAR-TASS]	20
Shakhrai Calls For Strengthening Economy [ITAR-TASS]	21
Coalition of Reforms Demands More Resolute Actions [ITAR-TASS]	21
Rutskoy Warns Against Mafia Seeking Political Power [Berlin BERLINER ZEITUNG 24-25 Apr]	21

Referendum Issues

Khasbulatov Backs Deputy Elections in Certain Cities [PRAVDA 28 Apr]	22
Popov: Referendum Vote Indicates Support for Reforms [ITAR-TASS]	22
Official Says Referendum Strengthened Council of Ministers [ITAR-TASS]	23
Yeltsin Aide on Early Referendum Results [IZVESTIYA 28 Apr]	23
Communists Complain of Media 'Indoctrination' of Voters [PRAVDA 28 Apr]	24
Yeltsin Urged To 'Radicalize' Reforms [ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 28 Apr]	24
Referendum Results Seen Inconclusive [SEGODNYA 27 Apr]	25
Presidential Council Members View Referendum [ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 29 Apr]	26
Yeltsin Promises Called 'Rhetoric,' 'Waste of Time' [ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 28 Apr]	27
Judge Disputes Constitutional Court Verdict [ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 28 Apr]	28

Supreme Soviet

Further on 28 Apr Supreme Soviet Session	29
Rutskoy Invited To Detail Charges [ITAR-TASS]	29
Rutskoy Addresses Session [Russian TV]	30
Privatization Program 'Unsatisfactory' [ITAR-TASS]	31
Security Force for Parliament Approved [ITAR-TASS]	31
Customs Code Adopted [ITAR-TASS]	31
Yugoslav Conflict Discussed [ITAR-TASS]	32
Deputies Condemn Stance on Yugoslavia [Russian TV]	32
Krasavchenko Comments on Privatization [Moscow Radio]	33
Kozyrev 27 Apr Address on Tajikistan [Russian TV]	34
Media Committee's Activities Criticized [Moscow Radio]	34
Chubays Deplores Parliament Decision on Privatization [Moscow Radio]	34
Sokolov Blames Gaydar for Economic Collapse [PRAVDA 24 Apr]	35

Regional Affairs

Presidential Decree Sets Early Chechen Elections [ITAR-TASS]	38
Chechnya Constitutional Court Calls For End to Fighting [ITAR-TASS]	38
Anti-Dudayev Rallies Continue in Chechnya Despite Ban [ITAR-TASS]	38
Chelyabinsk Elects New Oblast Head Despite Yeltsin Edict [ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 28 Apr]	38
Kalmyk President Recounts Meeting With Yeltsin [Moscow TV]	39
Paper Hints at Kalmyk Leader's 'Compromising Material' [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 24 Apr]	39
Mordovia Votes Against Yeltsin in Referendum [ITAR-TASS]	40
Novosibirsk Oblast Referendum Results Released [Radio Rossii]	40
North Ossetian, Ingushetian Situation Remains 'Complex' [ITAR-TASS]	41
Shevchenko Uranium Enrichment Plant Profiled [Moscow TV]	41
Agricultural Decline in Maritime Kray Reported [Moscow Radio]	42

UKRAINE

International Affairs

Kravchuk Speech to Cossacks Focuses on Nuclear Power Status [IZVESTIYA 29 Apr]	43
Foreign Ministry: Kostenko's Remarks on Nukes Not Official Position [Kiev International]	43

National Affairs

Kuchma Discusses Economy, Policy, Ethics [HOLOS UKRAYINY 24 Apr]	43
--	----

WESTERN REGION

Moldova

Sangheli Meets Clinton, Gore, Others in Washington [BASAPRESS]	49
Snegur, Yeltsin To Discuss Conflict in Eastern Regions [BASAPRESS]	49

Foreign Minister Receives Visiting EC Official [BASAPRESS]	49
Snegur Comments on Demilitarization Plan, Dniester Problem [Moscow Radio]	49
Snegur Views Reestablishment of Social, Political Situation [BASAPRESS]	49
Snegur Cites Difficulties in Transition to Market Economy [ITAR-TASS]	50
General Lebed Sees 'Stabilizing' Role for 14th Army [BASAPRESS]	50
'Reliable Sources' Say Lebed To Leave [BASAPRESS]	50
Meeting Protests Commander's Possible Withdrawal [BASAPRESS]	50
Military Commander Discusses Prospect of National Army [BASAPRESS]	51
Departing Romanian Envoy Meets Foreign Minister [BASAPRESS]	51
Concludes Mission, Makes Statement [BASAPRESS]	51

CAUCASUS

Azerbaijan

Deputies Blame Elchibey for 'Political Mistakes' in Karabakh [TURAN]	52
Yeltsin's Karabakh Envoy Arrives in Baku [ASSA-IRADA]	52
Panakh Guseynov Appointed Prime Minister [AZERTAC]	52
Killing of Rear Admiral Said 'Politically Motivated' [TURAN]	52

Georgia

Shevardnadze, Sigua Hold Talks With Sukhumi Officials [Tbilisi Radio]	52
Government Forms Abkhazian Defense Council [Tbilisi Radio]	52
Abkhazia Leader Nadareishvili Views Current Situation [Tbilisi Radio]	53
Threatens To Resign [SNARK]	53
Russian General Blames Ardzinba for Failed Sukhumi Attack [Tbilisi Radio]	53
Military Command Denies Moving Units To Aid Kitovani [Radio Rossii]	53
Shevardnadze Receives RSA Ambassador, Praises New Relations [Tbilisi Radio]	54

BALTIC STATES

Estonia

Official Says Russian Army Adding to Border Control Problems [ETA NEWS RELEASE]	55
Russian Signals Intelligence Station Continues Operations [Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER 25 Apr]	55

Lithuania

Foreign Minister Comments on Policy Issues, Envoy to U.S. [Vilnius Radio]	55
Brazauskas Welcomes Yeltsin Referendum Victory [Vilnius International]	56
Russian Military Experts Arrive for Troop Withdrawal Talks [Vilnius International]	56
Experts Coordinating Troop Withdrawal [BNS]	56
Fights, 'Misunderstandings' Reported on Polish Border [Vilnius Radio]	57
Landowners' Union Criticizes LDLP Agrarian Reform [LIETUVOS AIDAS 16 Apr]	57

CIS Leaders Conclude Meeting in Minsk 28 Apr

Economic Coordination Council Planned

*LD2804110993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English
1000 GMT 28 Apr 93*

[By BELINFORM correspondents Vladimir Glod and Larisa Lazar for TASS]

[Text] Minsk April 28 TASS—CIS heads of government agreed on Wednesday [28 April] to create a coordinating and consultative committee of the Commonwealth which will unite economic deputy prime ministers.

The council will meet once a month to discuss most urgent problems.

The heads of government also agreed to transform the CIS working group into the executive secretariat of the Commonwealth which will have membership quotas for each CIS country.

The heads of government succeeded to consider all 16 items on the agenda. They are now discussing mutual settlements between CIS states.

New Body To Meet Monthly

*WS2804132993 Minsk BELINFORM in Russian
1033 GMT 28 Apr 93*

[Text] All 16 issues on the agenda were discussed by CIS heads of government by 1000 GMT. A resolution to create a CIS coordination and consultation committee was adopted. The committee will be composed of deputy prime ministers in charge of economic issues. The resolution stipulates that they will hold regular sessions, approximately once a month, in order to solve the most urgent problems.

The participants of the session have also decided to reform the CIS Working Group into the Commonwealth Executive Secretariat. There are plans to introduce quotas for the number of representatives of each commonwealth state in the Secretariat.

After the discussion of the agenda topics, only the delegation leaders remained in the session hall to discuss issues regarding mutual payments among CIS members.

The heads of government have also decided to hold a joint session of heads of state and heads of government on 26 May. The summit's venue will be determined by the heads of state.

Some Refuse To Sign Documents

*WS2804142293 Minsk BELINFORM in Russian
1208 GMT 28 Apr 93*

[Text] The session of CIS heads of government has completed its work in Minsk. One-half of all documents were signed by all the participants. However, many documents lack the signature of the representative of Turkmenistan. Belarusian Prime Minister Kebich, who

was appointed chairman of the session, pointed out: "Although we have enough jet fuel and planes are flying regularly, representatives of Turkmenistan hurried out of the hall."

Uzbek representatives refused to sign the document on the search for MIA's and the liberation of individuals captured in Afghanistan and during other military conflicts.

Ukrainian Prime Minister Kuchma said the Ukrainian delegation ratified the charter of the coordination and consultation committee with the proviso that the committee will deal primarily with economic issues.

Conference 'Unexpectedly Delayed'

*LD2804140793 Moscow Mayak Radio Network
in Russian 1230 GMT 28 Apr 93*

[Text] As already reported, the CIS heads of government are discussing in Minsk, behind closed doors, the state of mutual settlements among the Commonwealth member states. The conference has been unexpectedly delayed; it took only two hours to discuss the preceding 16 questions, but the discussion of the last question has already been going on for an hour and a half.

During a brief interval, BELINFORM-TASS correspondents managed to ask Viktor Chernomyrdin, the head of the Russian Government, about the reason for this prolonged discussion. The reply was brief: the complexity of the issue. Nonetheless, he noted that discussion was proceeding normally.

Chernomyrdin 'Delighted' at Results

*LD2804151893 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service
in Russian 1405 GMT 28 Apr 93*

[By BELINFORM correspondents Vladimir Glod and Larisa Lazar for TASS]

[Text] Minsk, 28 Apr—Speaking at the news conference, Belarus Prime Minister Vyacheslav Kebich described the initialling of the statute on the coordinating and consultative committee as an event of historic importance. In particular, he said: "Just a year ago, the signing of this document would have been unthinkable. Moreover, no one would even have conceived of it."

Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin echoed this theme. He noted: "We are coming closer together all the time on the basis of the economic union. I have traveled far and wide throughout Russia lately, and everywhere people were telling me that it was necessary to unite in economic terms. I am delighted that we managed to find the right mechanism in Minsk, the road toward this unification.

A vivid example of this is the Yelabuga works. Each state of the Commonwealth is doing its share, and a real transnational campaign is being established. It is a very good thing.

Kebich, Chernomyrdin Comment*LD2804163193 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English
1549 GMT 28 Apr 93*

[By BELINFORM correspondents Vladimir Glod, Larisa Lazar for TASS]

[Text] Minsk April 28 TASS—Belarusian Prime Minister Vyacheslav Kebich addressed a news conference held in Minsk upon completion of the CIS summit, saying that signing a document on a coordinative-consultative committee was an event of tremendous importance. "A year ago we would not have signed such a document. Moreover, even the idea of it was impossible then," he said.

Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin noted that "we are getting closer on the basis of the economic union".

"Recently, I travelled a great deal about Russia and many times heard people say that we should unite in the economic sphere. I am glad that a mechanism and ways for such a union were found in Minsk. A good example of this is a plant in the city of Yelabuga. Each country is making its own contribution, and a really transnational company is being set up, which is very good," Chernomyrdin said.

Heads of CIS government, who met in Minsk today, recommended that the next CIS summit be held in Moscow on May 26. However, a final resolution on this matter should be adopted by leaders of the Commonwealth states.

Further on Kebich, Chernomyrdin*LD2804191493 Minsk Radio Minsk Network
in Belarusian 1715 GMT 28 Apr 93*

[Text] The CIS heads of government met today in Minsk. [passage indistinct] It is difficult to say how the discussion of the urgent problems went because the sittings were held behind closed doors. The situation became clearer to a certain extent at a news conference which was held straight away after the meeting. In particular, Vyacheslav Kebich, premier of the Republic of Belarus, stressed:

[Begin Kebich recording] Our meeting today was held, as you know, at the instruction of heads of state who here in Minsk on 16 April who adopted a decision to prepare a program of consolidating the CIS. You remember that the main directions of that program were set forth in the appeal of Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, president of the Russian Federation, to the heads of state of the CIS and were then made more precise and developed further at the recent meeting in Minsk.

Today we considered a package of documents which, in my opinion, have a very great significance for strengthening the economic integration of the Commonwealth countries. The agenda included 14 main issues, some of

them contained a whole block of serious problems of developing multilateral cooperation between our states.

I have in mind one question which was worded in just one line: On further consolidation of the Commonwealth. Behind it, there is a comprehensive program of preparing documents for organizational consolidation of the CIS, including setting up of permanent executive bodies without which, in my opinion, a normal functioning of the Commonwealth is simply impossible.

(?We) are still to take a lot of important decisions in future on improving defense abilities of the Commonwealth countries and deepening military cooperation. A package of proposals on these problems has also been included in the program of our future actions which will promote consolidation of the Commonwealth.

I must stress that we worked fruitfully and efficiently and were able to consider in three hours a whole range of issues which are suggested for the next meeting of heads of state, but which (?would) be well prepared at an expert level and (?would) not provoke serious objections. [end recording]

Viktor Chernomyrdin, head of the government of the Russian Federation, added:

[Begin Chernomyrdin recording] Essentially [words indistinct] were met with understanding and support. People themselves do not understand our division. I think, that our sacred duty as leaders first of all is to carry out this matter, to consolidate, to develop, to find ways and solutions, methods, mechanisms of organization of this union, I mean, first of all, of course, an economic one. [end recording]

'Great Advance' Noted*LD2804210593 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English
1626 GMT 28 Apr 93*

[By BELINFORM correspondents Vladimir Glod and Larisa Lazar for TASS]

[Text] Minsk April 28 TASS—There can be no doubt that today's meeting of CIS heads of government marked a great advance in the development of the Commonwealth of Independent States, observers believe, referring first of all to the "provision on CIS coordinating and consultative committee" initiated by the heads of government.

Coordinator of the CIS working group Ivan Korotechnya assessed the decisions passed at the meeting as very important and designed to considerably strengthen the commonwealth. "Above all, it is the creation of a coordinating and consultative committee and an executive secretariat of the Commonwealth. The Coordinating and Consultative Committee, which is to unite all CIS deputy prime ministers, is charged with responsibility for and supervision of the fulfilment of all CIS decisions, both new and those passed in the past. And the executive secretariat, which is to become a sort of successor to the working group, will include high-qualified specialists on

the basis of membership quotas for each of the CIS countries", Korotechnya said.

It looks as if the meeting has managed to find the mechanism for decisions implementation, which was so much spoken of before and whose absence was widely regarded as the main drawback of the Commonwealth. Indeed, some three hundred good and necessary decisions have already been passed, with very few of them being implemented. Now the situation is to change dramatically.

The fact of initialling a provision on the Coordinating and Consultative Committee was also described as an event of vital importance by Belarusian Prime Minister Vyacheslav Kebich, who in particular said that "only a year ago we would have signed such a document by no means. Moreover, even a thought of this would not have occurred to us".

As if to develop this idea, Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin said that "we are drawing nearer on the basis of economic integration. I have toured much of Russia lately, and heard people saying constantly that we should unite economically. It makes us happy that the Minsk meeting managed to find a mechanism for such an integration. A good example is the Yelabuga motor-car works. Each of the CIS states is contributing its share, which leads to the creation of a true transnational company. And this is very good."

The decision to set up the Coordinating and Consultative Committee and the Executive Secretariat of the Commonwealth was initialled by all participants in the Minsk meeting. The final decision to this effect is to be passed by CIS heads of state.

Furthermore, the Minsk meeting outlined a number of measures to be urgently taken in four fields, namely in the organizational, military, economic and political spheres, Korotechnya reported. These measures, due to be implemented during May and June, are intended to further develop the ideas and proposals moved by Boris Yeltsin in March, 1993.

Commenting on the current situation on the Tajik-Afghan border, the participants in the meeting noted that each country sees its own solution to this problem.

A joint meeting of CIS heads of state and government is scheduled for May 26. Most heads of government think

it would be best to meet in Moscow. Though a final decision on this matter is to be taken by heads of state.

Ukraine on Economic Committee

*LD2804204793 Moscow Radio Rossii Network
in Russian 1900 GMT 28 Apr 93*

[Text] An accord on the CIS coordinating bodies was the main result of the Minsk meeting of heads of government of the Commonwealth countries. This was stated by the participants in the meeting at its final news conference. A coordinating and consultative committee will become the main body of the CIS. It will be granted the right to adopt decisions on specific economic, political and military issues. The CIS states will be represented in it by vice premiers.

Ukraine voiced a special opinion on this. It insists that the committee should deal with economic issues alone, and the composition and level of representation be determined in every specific case.

Venue for 26 May Summit Viewed

*LD2804152693 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service
in Russian 1415 GMT 28 Apr 93*

[By BELINFORM correspondent for TASS]

[Text] Minsk, 28 Apr—The CIS heads of government who gathered in Minsk today recommended that the next joint meeting to be attended by the CIS heads of state and heads of government be held on 26 May in Moscow. However, the final decision on this issue is to be made by the leaders of Commonwealth states.

Commander Says All Russian Aircraft Removed From Baltics

*LD2704213493 Riga Radio Riga Network in Latvian
1700 GMT 27 Apr 93*

[Text] Air Force Lieutenant General Vasilii Proskurin, commander of the air force of the Baltic Fleet, has told a Baltic News Service correspondent that all Russian aircraft have been removed from the Baltic states, from Suurkula in Estonia, and Tukums and Skulte in Latvia. The general stated that in the past two years the conditions for basing aircraft in the Baltic countries have become very complex. Thus the Russians will plan air force activity in other ways in the event of a [words indistinct] threat.

Kozyrev Interviewed on Yugoslav Situation

LD2804204193 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1745 GMT 28 Apr 93

[Interview with Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev with correspondent Vladimir Martynov; place and date not given; from the "X" program—recorded]

[Text] [Martynov] In your opinion, why is it that very often, when speaking about Serbs in Bosnia, everytime one is talking about Yugoslavia? I mean the following. The Serbs in Bosnia have done this and that, and Serbia, as an integral part of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, is to blame. In your opinion, why is the responsibility for what some are doing being shifted to others?

[Kozyrev] This is very simple. You see, the thing is that for a long time the Belgrade leadership has been claiming that there is a complete demarcation between them and the Bosnian Serbs. In actual fact, it is very easy to prove this. Now, at the very last moment, before the voting of the Assembly of the Bosnian Serbs—better late than never—the Belgrade leadership, Yugoslav President [Dobrica] Cosic, Serbian President [Slobodan] Milosevic, and President of Montenegro [Momir] Bulatovic at long last made a political call to approve the Vance-Owen plan. This is a very good sign. Besides, all their political statements, including the demarcation and the present, more weighted, I must say, political position can be very easily translated into the language of practical things—to stop supplies of ammunition, to stop supplies of fuel and lubricant materials for military equipment and a whole number of similar and quite practical things that will immediately and convincingly demonstrate to us and to the whole international community that, in fact, not only in word, but in deed both the political and mainly material demarcation is under way.

It is for this reason that sanctions are being imposed on Serbia—not because the international community is ignorantly confusing Bosnian Serbs with Serbian Serbs, but because it is perfectly clear that those who support war, even if I am not necessarily associating them with the leadership, and in any case, they cannot in any way be associated either with the Serbs in Serbia itself or with the Serbs in Bosnia.

[Martynov] You cannot associate them with the people.

[Kozyrev] Absolutely correct. This is why I am saying that we will be hoping that the referendum there will show that the people are as far away from those who support war as you can get, both here and there. I hope the referendum (?will show) [words indistinct]—so we are now putting forward dramatic suggestions like, for example, a trip to the conflict zone by the foreign ministers of the five permanent members of the Security Council in order to break through the psychological blockade and show that there is no international plot against Serbia, but on the contrary we are talking about the international community being ready to take the

most dramatic and decisive steps to save Serbs and their national interests from sliding any further into the bloody abyss, into which they are being pushed by those who support war, or the national patriots.

[Martynov] How great is the influence of the leadership of the Republic of Serbia within Yugoslavia on others taking part in the conflict on Bosnian and Croatian territory?

[Kozyrev] I think that it may not be 100 percent influence. It probably isn't, but it's quite significant, especially on people in military uniforms. This is another step Belgrade could take: declare them, I don't know, partisans or mercenaries or bandits, that is, in one word—

[Martynov, interrupting] Belgrade says they're volunteers.

[Kozyrev] Well yes, you see, it's one thing... [incomplete sentence as heard] Words mean a lot here. One approach is to call them volunteers and say well, boys, you're doing everything right, but you are not our regular forces. It is another thing to say you know, all officers taking part in ethnic cleansing, bombardments of peaceful villages, seizure of territory, and not halting combat operations will be regarded as having left the service if no more, or will be deprived of all, let us say—

[Martynov, interrupting] Length of service.

[Kozyrev] Length of service and so on, decorations, it will be a simple thing that this is forbidden, do you understand, forbidden to anybody who considers himself a Yugoslav officer.

I'll tell you that then we would probably have seen that the process was significant. Of course, there are always people who will disregard that as well, and that is probably a fact. But I'm sure that a significant proportion of the officer corps would not choose that.

[Martynov] Is Croatia prepared, in your view, to do the same as regards its officers and men in Bosnia?

[Kozyrev] Yes, things are also quite difficult with Croatia. In general, the fact is being confirmed once more that we were right here too from the outset, when we said that there were no angels there, and there was no need to think that, if the Serbs bore enormous responsibility—well, the militant Serbs, the Serbian national patriots—bore the lion's share of the responsibility, that did not mean that the Croatian national patriots or the Muslim fighters bore no responsibility. They do bear it, and they are committing monstrous crimes.

For precisely that reason, together with France, we supported, from the outset, the idea of setting up an international tribunal and insisted that it was for Muslim and Croatian, as well as Serbian, fighters who had committed crimes against humanity and humanism.

Here is today's statement by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin on the matter: The Russian Federation will not protect those who set themselves up in opposition to the world community. Both Serbian nationalists and any other participants in the conflict who rely on violence will encounter a firm rebuff from the UN. That is an answer as regards both the Croats and the Muslims.

So, in point of fact, we are not talking about an anti-Serb position, but democrats and all sensible people in Moscow, Paris, and Belgrade working toward the adoption of the Vance-Owen plan and peace. A party advocating war in any of those three capitals will, on the other hand, encourage further bloodshed in which values and lives of Serbs themselves will perish, along with those of Muslims and Croats who are no less Slavonic than Serbs.

[Martynov] Andrey Vladimirovich, why is it that it is always the case that the world community comes out against one side participating in the conflict? Why is it that these documents state: Serbs and other forces? Why do they not write: Croats and other forces, why is it, at long last, that there is no list: Croats, Serbs, and Muslims, why is it always Serbs alone?

[Kozyrev] Well, because the only force that has not signed the Vance-Owen plan is the Serbs and that is why it is talked about and named. All the remaining ones—although Izetbegovic, let us say, the president of Bosnia, though a Muslim, representing the Muslim community, was furious at the beginning when he saw the plan.

Therein lies the force of that plan. The plan does not satisfy, you know, absolutist or extremist demands of any side. It does not favor anyone. This is its essence; it proposes solutions that are not to the liking of extremists on either side.

However, after a mature reflection, everyone understands that that is precisely what compromise is all about: you have to concede something, you have to get a concession somewhere, but you have got to stop somewhere and put a halt to the bloodshed.

So, despite the first fury, simple fury and indignation on the part of Izetbegovic, who went to Washington to complain, incidentally and who, as it were, held talks with us on this issue—and the Croats reacted identically to begin with but later they clenched their teeth all the same and came to understand that yes, the plan must be signed. That is why Serbs are now being mentioned, because the Serb leadership did not sign the plan.

[Martynov] History tells us that pressure on that country in the past always led to an even greater resistance. Maybe this is the mindset of the people or the country or that such is their historic fate. Does it not seem to you that stepping up sanctions against Yugoslavia and the absence of sanctions against Croatia will lead to an even greater resistance of the people and that politicians will then be altogether unable to rule the people and that is assuming that they can do so now?

[Kozyrev] All such decisions have negative aspects and, in particular, the so-called syndrome of a besieged fortress tends to intensify. What is, however, important to bear in mind is that we are not here selecting the best option or the good option. We can speak here only of bad options and very bad options, of adopting a decision of some sort and sticking to it and doing something to stop the aggression or else doing nothing and not adopting such decisions. This is something like waging a defensive war. A defensive war is, of course, additional bloodshed, because the defenders themselves begin to kill, nothing good here, of course. I want to say again that we are talking of something that is bad, or very bad or complete inaction and paralysis, something the international community cannot allow to take place toward the end of the 20th century, or else measures of one kind or another that certainly entail definite costs. We fully support—and put forward this idea together with the French—the setting up of a tribunal, the mandate of which, that is to say, the task of which is as follows: After the end of the war, all war criminals must be punished, irrespective, as it were, of religion or what their nationality is: Croat, Muslim, or Serb.

For this disaster, for this tragedy, for the destroyed towns, for the hundreds of lives, the war criminals must be made answerable once the war has ended.

Further on Kozyrev Comments

PM2804160793 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29
Apr 93 First Edition p 1

[Interview with Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev by Maksim Yusin: "Andrey Kozyrev: Vice President and Deputies Must Respect the People's Opinion and Themselves"]

[Text] [Yusin] What is your comment on the referendum results?

[Kozyrev] On 25 April Boris Yeltsin obtained a third mandate from the people. The first time it happened was in the presidential elections in June 1991, and the second time was during the putsch. Contrary to the opposition's predictions, Russians supported not only the president himself but his policy of reforms as well. The main thing now is to fully implement the will of the people and move forward decisively, without hesitation and without concessions.

I do not see any reason to create a coalition government at this time. For the simple reason that there is no one to form a coalition with. Before the referendum the majority of forces calling themselves centrist were in opposition to Yeltsin. Above all, the vice president. Despite that, the president won a convincing victory—alone, without Rutskoy. In fact, he obtained more votes than in June 1991, when they were in tandem.

I think the vice president should show respect for the people's opinion and for himself. The same goes for the body of deputies. No democratic state would see the

question of early elections as constitutional. The majority of referendum participants voted for a new election of deputies. After that, will the congress and the Supreme Soviet continue with the pseudodemocratic and pseudolegal game they have been playing recently? Do the deputies and the vice president have the moral right to remain in their posts?

[Yusin] How will the referendum results affect Russian foreign policy?

[Kozyrev] By supporting the president the voters were also supporting his foreign policy course. This should give us confidence to act in the international arena.

[Yusin] How do you regard the Bosnian Serbs' refusal to accept the Vance-Owen plan?

[Kozyrev] The outcome of the vote in the Bosnian Serbs' parliament confirmed my worst fears. By way of self-criticism, I want to say that our tactics of delaying the adoption of a resolution on stiffer sanctions against Yugoslavia were not effective enough. The Bosnian Serb leadership and the national-patriotic forces in Belgrade never intended to use the three-month delay we secured to hold serious negotiations.

[Yusin] How are events going to develop in the future, do you think?

[Kozyrev] The referendum of Bosnian Serbs, planned for mid-May, is the last chance. I hope the people will be wiser than the politicians representing them and support the Vance-Owen plan. The outcome of the vote will largely depend on the position of the Belgrade leadership and the Yugoslav media, which, unfortunately, are to a considerable extent controlled by the national-patriots.

The appeal by the presidents of Serbia, Montenegro, and Yugoslavia to the Bosnian Serbs to accept the Vance-Owen plan sounds promising. But why was this statement made only a few hours before the vote? If the Yugoslav leaders really want a settlement, it is time to switch from words to actions and stop supplying Bosnia with spare parts, ammunition, and fuel and lubricants and publicly condemn the Bosnian Serb leaders' adventurist policy. They will not last long without material and moral support from Belgrade and will be forced to compromise.

It is not yet too late to save the Serb people from the disaster the red-browns are driving them toward. The Serbs must see that they will not be able to win this war anyway. At the end of the 20th century the world will not allow ethnic cleansing on such a monstrous scale to go unpunished.

Unless there is an end to the bloodshed in Bosnia, the international community will go even further and take steps envisaged by the UN Charter—severance of diplomatic relations, establishment of a blockade, and, ultimately, the use of military force.

[Yusin] Is Russia prepared to revise its stance on an embargo on arms supplies to the Bosnian Muslims?

[Kozyrev] This is a difficult question. On the one hand, many members of the Security Council are demanding the lifting of the embargo. Their arguments have a certain logic to them. If the international community cannot protect the Muslims, who find themselves the weakest side in the conflict, they must be given the chance to arm and defend themselves. But, on the other hand, such a decision would lead to a new bout of confrontation. By lifting the ban on arms supplies to the region we would be effectively admitting that the conflict can only be resolved by military means.

[Yusin] What was Moscow's reaction to the idea of merging the Serb-controlled areas in Bosnia and Croatia into a single "Serb republic"?

[Kozyrev] We regard that as unacceptable. The state's borders can only be altered by peaceful means, on the basis of a plebiscite, and with the sides' mutual consent. If territory is wrested from Croatia and Bosnia today, it could rebound on Serbia itself tomorrow—Kosovo and Sandzak would demand separation as well. In upholding the principle of the inviolability of borders we are acting on the basis of Russian Federation interests as well.

Khasbulatov Alleges Clinton-Yeltsin Deal on FRY

LD2804184593 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1701 GMT 28 Apr 93

[Excerpt] Moscow, April 28 (TANJUG)—By making statements detrimental to Serbs, such as blaming the conflict in former Yugoslavia on Serbs only, Russian President Boris Yeltsin had shown that Russia would turn a blind eye to a military intervention against Serbs in Bosnia, which is something Yeltsin and U.S. President Bill Clinton have struck a secret deal on, opposition circles said in Moscow.

Responding to Yeltsin's recent statements against Serbs in Bosnia, Chairman of the Russian Parliament Ruslan Khasbulatov on Wednesday told Supreme Soviet deputies that there was a possibility that Yeltsin and Clinton in Vancouver struck a secret deal on former Yugoslavia. There are indications that the two leaders agreed in Vancouver that after the referendum in Russia Moscow will agree to U.S. actions against Yugoslavia, Khasbulatov said.

Political and diplomatic circles in Moscow, however, said that Yeltsin's recent statements were a reflection of his intention to demonstrate his determination to be active in the international scene after his referendum victory, since that was his first statement on international policy after the referendum. [passage omitted]

Units Train in Chechnya To Protect Bosnia Muslims

MK2804131493 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 28 Apr 93 p 3

[NEGA report published in "Chechnya" column]

[Text] Mountain detachments are being trained in the Chechnya mountains to participate in combat operations in former Yugoslavia.

According to a Chechnya official, who asked that his identity not be divulged, the detachments are being formed to protect the Muslim population of Bosnia.

The source also noted that it is hardly likely that anyone would dare name the initiators and sponsors of this action.

Balkan Intervention Said Threatening Americans in Russia

MK2804103093 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 28 Apr 93 p 2

[Ivan Rodin report under the rubric "Parliament": "Opposition Analyzes Referendum Outcome. Moreover, National Salvation Front Does Not Guarantee Safety of Americans in Russia"]

[Text] The Russian Unity parliamentary bloc of opposition factions so far refrains from stating its united stance on the results of the recent referendum because the final results are not in. Some figures, however, were commented on at an open session of the coordination council. The opposition concludes that the Congress reflects the pattern of moods in society on the grounds that approximately a third of the entire population spoke for confidence in Yeltsin while about a third of the deputies at the Congress also support him. Deputy Astafyev stated that Mensheviks are in power in this country. Deputy Sayenko, having named the regions that supported Yeltsin and where corruption and the selling out of the country are the most rampant (Moscow, Maritime Kray), concluded that it was the mafia stratum that came out for the president.

Nikolay Pavlov read out a statement of the National Salvation Front regarding the latest UN Security Council resolution in force since yesterday morning. According to the deputy the new tendency in international relations is to use NATO troops under UN auspices—this policy has found its most forcible expression in Yugoslavia. Until recently it has been possible to curb the anger of our fellow countrymen, the statement reads, but we want to warn that in the event of a military intervention, the National Salvation Front would not be able to guarantee the safety of citizens of the United States and West Europe present on the territory of Russia.

Churkin Not Optimistic About Bosnian Situation

AU2804144093 Belgrade BORBA in Serbo-Croatian 27 Apr 93 p 10

[Interview with Vitaliy Churkin, deputy foreign minister and special envoy to the peace talks on former Yugoslavia, by Djuro Bilbija; place and date not given: "I Do Not Expect Anything Good"]

[Text] Vitaliy Churkin, Russian deputy foreign minister and Yeltsin's special envoy to the peace talks on the former Yugoslavia, is not very optimistic regarding the possibility of new diplomatic initiatives after the decision of the Assembly of Bosnia Serbs.

[Bilbija] What is Russia's official position on the decision of the Assembly of the Serbian republic [of Bosnia-Herzegovina]?

[Churkin] What position should we take? Once thing is certain: the situation has become even more complicated. Although we were expecting this decision from the Bosnian Serbs, we nevertheless hoped that the latest Owen-Karadzic contacts would get things moving and push the negotiating process toward some kind of solution. Unfortunately, this did not happen.

[Bilbija] Was there a realistic chance of Karadzic signing the plan in principle, with certain reserves that would be discussed at subsequent negotiations?

[Churkin] We considered this variant also. However, it seems that the necessary conditions for activating this variant had not been created.

[Bilbija] Is there a chance of "a signature with reserve" in the following days and weeks?

[Churkin] It is hard to say. I do not expect any significant events within the next few days. I am not expecting anything good, but I also think that we should not despair. Maybe a possibility of some kind of political turnabout will be found after all. However, for the time being, there is no basis for great optimism.

[Bilbija] What is Russia's attitude toward the West's preparations to bomb "Serbian positions?"

[Churkin] I am not aware that such preparations are in progress. Russia is still in favor of a political solution to the Bosnian crisis, you understand. I believe that at the moment, the greatest priority would be to prevent any kind of worsening of the situation around the Muslim enclaves in eastern Bosnia. A matter of extreme priority would be—in the case of Gorazde and Zepa—to reach agreements analogous to the one in Srebrenica. This would be extremely useful, because it would be the way in which to prevent things from veering off into some other, more extreme direction, while the search for a political solution is in progress. However, for this you need a lot of self-control.

[Bilbija] Do you think the Serbs will demonstrate this kind of self-control?

[Churkin] I do not know, but I do know that it is of strategic importance to go for solutions similar to the Srebrenica one.

[Bilbija] Can you be more precise and tell us what you meant when a couple of days ago, you said that Russia might present "several new initiatives connected to Bosnia?"

[Churkin] I am afraid that this remark was taken out of context and misinterpreted. I was thinking of new contacts regarding the Bosnian crisis. As for the "initiatives," I was thinking of Kozyrev's proposal to hold a special session of the Security Council, and of the possibility of reopening the London Conference. However, I fear that the calling of both forums will now be connected with great difficulties. Many people throughout the world no longer believe that the Bosnian Serbs will contribute any new proposals to these possible meetings which would lead to a compromise that would be acceptable to others, too. They are afraid that this could lead to confrontations with current Serbian positions and to yet another attempt at reverting the talks about the maps back to the beginning. That is why, at the moment, I am not an optimist regarding possible new diplomatic initiatives concerning the Bosnian crisis.

[Bilbija] Could you comment on Kozyrev's latest statement, given to American television, that the time has come for direct Russian-American consultations, which other parties could participate in at some later date, and whose result would be the implementation of even more radical, sharper international measures "for the absolute stopping of the war?"

[Churkin] Unfortunately, I cannot do so. I am not aware of this statement made by our minister.

PRAVDA Article Criticizes West's 'Biased Approach' to Bosnia

PM2804152993 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Apr 93 p 3

[Feature by Sergey Svistunov: "The East Is a Delicate Matter"]

[Text] During World War II the allies sought to put an end to fascists and Hitlerites, but certainly not to the German people. Half a century later the civilized West is carrying out something that is hard to explain from a commonsense viewpoint: the satanization of the Serbs, those most active members of the allied coalition who made a great and worthy contribution to the victory over the "brown plague." At the same time it is the Serbs, as such, as a "bloodthirsty" and "ruthless" ethnoses.

In covering the tragedy of the Yugoslav peoples, the majority of the Western press, alas, takes a biased approach to what is happening. It is not worth trying to make those who maliciously engage in this change their mind: This is a useless undertaking. But there are also those who sincerely try to get to the bottom of what is

happening but who fall into the snares of refined propaganda lies and take provocative fabrications and actions at face value.

A graphic example of this kind of disinformation is provided by the reports on the "ethnic cleansing" allegedly being carried out by Serbs in the city of Trebinje. In fact, the mass resettlement of Muslims from this zone is being carried out by...the leaders of an extremist Muslim organization—the Party of Democratic Action [SDA]. The task which they are setting here is obvious: to convince the world community that the West's military intervention on the territory of the former Yugoslavia is the only possible and correct solution and to convince the United Nations that it is possible to instill order in Bosnia and Herzegovina only by mobilizing large international military forces in addition to the contingents of the "blue helmets."

At the same time they are agitating to have people moved not just anywhere but to neighboring Montenegro, thereby also pursuing another end: to strengthen groups of an Islamic orientation on the territory of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, to which is allocated the shock role in attempts to further mess up the federation of Serbia and Montenegro.

The editorial office has in its possession documents which leave no doubt about the true nature of the notorious "ethnic cleansing" in the region of the city of Trebinje. You too, esteemed readers, will familiarize yourselves with them. The first document is a private instruction from the SDA leadership in Sarajevo for the party's local committee in Trebinje.

To the SDA, Trebinje

Instruction for Resettlement From Trebinje

Since the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina is being sharply complicated from the security viewpoint, particularly since Karadzic and his clique in Pale (i.e. the government of the Serbian Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina) accepted the Geneva documents, it is necessary to act urgently and to take the following measures on the territory of the commune of the city of Trebinje for the purpose of realizing the aspirations of all Muslims and preserving and strengthening our state of Bosnia and Herzegovina:

I

By means of our activists all Muslims, particularly distinguished and rich Muslims, are to be persuaded to leave Trebinje without delay and to move to Montenegro.

II

Movable and immovable property must partly be sold and, as far as possible, be left in store with proven Serbs who are friends of Muslims and opponents of Karadzic's treacherous policy.

III

Do not shy away from using pressure and even force against Muslims who do not obey the order.

IV

On arrival in Montenegro make contact with the SDA, Merhamet, and our people in the Liberal Union of Montenegro, where you will receive further instructions on what to do and how. All our religious groups in Montenegro will give you assistance. Brothers in Tuzima, Podgorica, Plav, Rozaj, and throughout Montenegro await you. When we have achieved our ends, all the lost property will be returned to you. We will estimate your sacrifices at their true worth. Muslims throughout the world look on you with hope.

Sarajevo, 20 January 1993

[Signed] Hasan Sendzic, SDA secretary

The second document is an appeal by the local SDA committee to the Muslim commune of Trebinje:

To the SDA Committee, Trebinje

Appeal

Complying with the orders of the center and mindful of a decisive moment in the destiny of the Muslim people, we urge you to do the following:

At this moment the universal principles of the Islamic religion sent through Allah's messages impose on us the obligation to make our own contribution to the cause of creating a sovereign Bosnia and Herzegovina internationally recognized thanks to the help of friends throughout the world.

The Serbian-Chetnik armada headed by the leader Karadzic is trying to hamper our holy intentions by deceiving the world public, particularly now, in Geneva. It falsely asserts the loyalty of the Trebinje Muslims to the Serbian-Chetnik dictatorship and their devotion to the so-called "Serb Republic" and its military haiduks.

We urge you to embark quietly and cautiously, but bravely and in an organized manner, on a temporary departure from our dear and always Bosnian-Muslim Trebinje, to where, with the help of Allah and the strength of our power and our friends, we will later return in triumph.

Our temporary sufferings might seem too great to irrevocable people and to those with insufficient knowledge of the matter. But they are incomparable with what we will get in the end and very soon.

The minimum that is required of us is to pull out all Muslims from the so-called "Troops of the Serb Republic." Sharing the fate of our entire people, it is also our obligation to move to Montenegro along with our families and some of our citizens.

We assure you that this is not a road into the unknown and into suffering. Reception centers await us there, where everyone will be given attention and instructions. Through proven channels and with the assistance of our activists in Rozaj and Plav you will be provided with transport to Western countries and other places. On all questions that are unclear ask for detailed instructions from activists in Trebinje and at reception centers on Montenegrin territory.

[Signed] SDA plenipotentiary in Trebinje (signature illegible)

Panetta Cited on Obstacles to Aid for Russia

PM2804193193 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Apr 93 First Edition p 3

[Aleksandr Shalnev report: "America Will Help Itself First of All, Only Then Will It Help the Russians"]

[Text] Washington—During his first 100 days in power, President Bill Clinton's relations with Congress have turned out to be extremely strained, which places many of the present administration's programs and plans in jeopardy, including plans connected with giving aid to Russia.

This is the assessment of one of the most influential members of Clinton's administration—Leon Panetta, director of the White House Office of Management and Budget.

In an interview with reporters, Panetta explained the complexity of the situation in which Clinton finds himself on Capitol Hill and the extremely uneven economic situation in America. The optimism Americans displayed at the time of the November presidential election last year has diminished appreciably, the director of the Office of Management and Budget noted.

An additional factor, of course, is the fact that transferring the U.S. economy onto a purely civilian track—closing down military bases, intensive defense conversion—is yielding not only positive but also extremely negative results. And legislators cannot fail to take this into account when the White House submits proposals to them for examination, proposals which, as they see it, could incur even greater harm for Americans.

Leon Panetta announced that he is still looking for ways to finance the \$1.8 billion package promised by America at the recent meeting of G-7 foreign and finance ministers.

According to Panetta, "political realities" in the United States are such that members of Congress will not be prepared to agree to cutting "domestic" expenditure in order to help Russia. The director of the Office of Management and Budget noted that the legislators would first of all like to ratify programs designed to boost employment within America itself, and only then get down to helping the Russians.

Michael Kantor, the U.S. President's representative at trade talks, also focused on this sequence of actions. Speaking Tuesday at a conference organized by the U.S.-Russian Business Council, Kantor intimated fairly clearly that America would build its relations with Russia in such a way as to ensure that the U.S. labor market is protected in every possible way.

In other words, Russia will find it hard to count on actively exporting its products to the United States if these exports pose a threat to U.S. workers' jobs.

Special Envoy Strobe Talbott also spoke at the conference. I was keen to find out from him how things stood on implementing the aid package announced at the summit meeting in Vancouver.

Judging by Talbott's answer, the implementation of the Vancouver package has not yet begun: The special envoy only referred to specific projects in the future tense. Incidentally, Strobe Talbott intends to make his first official visit to the former Union at the beginning of May.

Norway's Holst Opens Consulate General in St. Petersburg

PM2804170093 Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 21 Apr 93 p 9

[Halvor Tjonn report: "Interested Holst Believes in New Deal in Norwegian-Russian Cooperation"]

[Text] On Monday evening [19 April] Foreign Minister Johan Jorgen Holst carried out the official opening of Norway's new consulate general in St. Petersburg. Today Holst opens our consulate general in Murmansk. This means that Norway is showing its face in northwestern Russia in a way that is very different from the past.

Not least because of his great personal interest our relatively new foreign minister is indicating that there are very special prospects for a Norwegian presence in northwestern Russia.

"This is our immediate neighborhood. What happens here affects us directly. Northwestern Russia could become the locomotive for the development of the whole of Russia, and this could have direct side effects in the form of more jobs in the northern parts of our country," Holst said in a meeting with Norwegian journalists after the opening of the consulate general in St. Petersburg.

The Norwegian Foreign Minister and the Norwegian Export Council did not stint when the opening of the consulate general in St. Petersburg was celebrated. The function suite at the Hotel Astoria, rich in tradition, was hired and a couple of hundred guests, chiefly Russians, were invited. The most prominent Russian guest was St. Petersburg Mayor Anatoliy Sobchak, a politician who is considered to be of increasing significance in Russian politics.

Johan Jorgen Holst could not fail to impress his Russian audience when he began his speech of welcome in fluent Russian. It is well known that in the second half of the fifties Holst took the armed forces' Russian course, and as far as is known is the only West European foreign minister who can talk to Russians without an interpreter.

In his speech he stressed that Norway and Russia are neighbors of a rare kind. In the age of the sagas four Norwegian kings spent longer or shorter periods in Russia. The time is now ripe to find our way back to old ties. In a time of limited resources it is more usual to close foreign missions than to open new ones. The fact that so much attention is being paid to this region is an indication of how high a priority Norway gives to this neighborly relationship. The consulates general in St. Petersburg and Murmansk are an important new initiative for Norway, he affirmed.

For his part Mayor Sobchak said that the Norwegian initiative is an indication that there is faith in political developments in Russia. The Norwegian telecommunications company and several Norwegian firms have already worked in St. Petersburg with great success. Norway's contribution in this connection is a help in integrating Russia in the new and expanded Europe more quickly, he said.

After opening the consulate general in St. Petersburg Holst traveled on yesterday morning to Arkhangelsk, where he was to visit the closed industrial complex of Severodvinsk. For decades the shipyards at Severodvinsk were a center for the production of nuclear submarines.

Also on the agenda was a visit to the Bjorn A/S wood products company, one of the very first Norwegian-financed firms in Russia which is producing its own products.

This morning Holst will take part in the opening of the Norsk-Pomor university center, a center which will form the framework for cooperation between academic institutions in northern Norway and Arkhangelsk.

Holst told Norwegian journalists in St. Petersburg on Monday evening that for him personally it is very interesting to be involved in this new deal in Norwegian-Russian cooperation. The first paid job he had in his life was on the Norwegian-Russian border. That was in the summer of 1958 when he worked for a few months as Russian interpreter for the border commissioner.

"Personally I have a great feeling for ordinary Russians. Russian culture attracts me and I believe that the Eastern Europeans, the Russians included, will have much to give the new Europe," he said.

Holst hopes that in the course of the coming months and years the countries of the Barents region will rapidly give cooperation a concrete content. For Norway there is one thing that takes precedence over everything else—the

cleaning-up of the nuclear pollution which threatens the environment in the Arctic Ocean.

In the days immediately prior to the start of Holst's visit on Monday great confusion surrounded his planned meeting with Foreign Minister Kozyrev. After much to-ing and fro-ing it does look as if the meeting will take place.

According to Norwegian sources, a whole list of the most important problems in Norwegian-Russian cooperation will be discussed in detail when the two foreign ministers meet. If, because of the tense situation in Moscow, there is not enough time to go through everything tomorrow, Holst has made it clear that he would be glad to return to Russia in the near future.

Goes to Arkhangelsk Conference

PM2804173693 Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 22 Apr 93 p 4

[NORSK TELEGRAMBYRA report: "A 'Yes' to Yeltsin is a 'Yes' to Cooperation"]

[Text] A "yes" to Yeltsin and the continuation of the reform process in Sunday's referendum will be the best foundation for the development of cooperation in the Barents region. Both Norwegian Foreign Minister Johan Jorgen Holst and his Russian counterpart, Andrey Kozyrev, clearly stated what it is they want when they took part in the spring conference which Tromso University is arranging in Arkhangelsk this week.

To the very end it was uncertain whether Kozyrev would come to Arkhangelsk at all. In addition the planned meeting between the two foreign ministers in Moscow had been postponed indefinitely. When Holst arrived at the conference late on Tuesday [20 April] evening he was able to report that the meeting in Moscow would take place after all. On Wednesday Andrey Kozyrev also arrived. The visit by Holst is really historic since he is the first Norwegian foreign minister to visit this once closed city.

Kozyrev said that a "no" will mean a return to the isolation of the past, and that only a "yes" can secure Russia a place among the world's civilized nations.

But it was the Barents region the two foreign ministers had come to talk about. The basis of the cooperation is the need to find joint solutions to a number of problems which affect both Norway and Russia. Holst mentioned them in order: overfishing in the Barents Sea, the negotiations for a demarcation line in the Barents Sea, the dumping of radioactive waste off Novaya Zemlya, and the growing xenophobia in Europe. He was particularly concerned over this latter problem.

"There is every reason to fear that the first conflict in the new Europe could give rise to such forms of nationalism, which in the final analysis wants ethnic divides and state borders in Europe to coincide. Against the background of the patchwork quilt history has woven on our continent,

this is a recipe for endless war," he said. He said that regional cooperation arrangements can help to make state borders more open and give people a new identity in addition to their national and European identities.

Kozyrev spoke out in support of similar arrangements in cooperation in the Baltic Sea region. In other words, a reshaping of the role of the nation state is taking place. Something else that is new is that minorities have been given permanent representation in this cooperation.

Kozyrev greatly stressed the Russians' need to open up to the rest of the world. This applies not least to the Arkhangelsk region which was a tightly closed region during the Cold War.

He touched on the current conflict in Russia between the supporters of reform with President Boris Yeltsin at their head and those who want to slow down the reform process.

"The Russian idea is not about locking yourself in, but about opening up to the rest of the world. A 'no' in the referendum means that it will be impossible to implement this idea," he said.

Negotiator Views Latvia-Russian Talks

MK2804133093 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 28 Apr 93 p 3

[Dmitriy Borisov report published in "Russia-Latvia" column: "Russian-Latvian Interstate Negotiations Postponed Indefinitely, Says Sergey Zotov, Head of Russian Delegation at Talks With Latvia"]

[Text] The reason for this decision, according to S. Zotov, was the statement by Russian Federation President Boris Yeltsin, and also the Russian delegation's concern over the discussion in the Latvian Supreme Council of a "resolution laying down a legal foundation for subsequent deportation of tens of thousands of ethnic Russians," scheduled for 28 April.

This document, in the opinion of the chief Russian negotiator, hinders what are already difficult negotiations between the interstate delegations over Russian troop withdrawals from Latvia. He stressed that the decisions pending in the Latvian parliament are of an inhumane nature. At the same time S. Zotov noted that one gets the impression that Latvia actually needs a permanent presence of Russian troops on its territory as an excuse for various provocative actions.

Sergey Zotov for the first time disclosed the number of Russian troops remaining on Latvia's territory. It has fallen from 57,000 last year to 22,000. He also pointed out that Boris Yeltsin's statement to the effect that "foundations for ethnic cleansing are being created in Latvia" is not simply an appeal to the Russian media but an instruction for Russia's chief representatives in the CSCE and the United Nations to meet with the leaders of these organizations and urge them to use their

authority in resolving the problems of ethnic Russians. The head of the Russian delegation expressed his deep conviction that "such inhuman actions by the Latvian government and parliament would have been impossible without the tacit consent of the West."

"Russia is coming through a period when it is finally becoming clear who are the friends and who are the enemies of democratic transformations in Russia," Sergey Zotov said. "Support for President Yeltsin's reforms is often hypocritical, and meanwhile many Western countries are trying to destabilize the situation in Russia via the Baltic countries." According to S. Zotov, Latvia and Estonia themselves do not understand the shortsightedness of their policy, adopting a position of political revanchism and attempting to take revenge against Russians. Against the backdrop of tremendous efforts by the Russian delegation, the Russian Foreign Affairs Ministry, and Defense Ministry, one is often aware of "little pinpricks" and unlawful actions on the part of the Latvian authorities. A good case in point is the failure to observe the noncommercial settlements accords whereby some \$25 million transferred by the Defense Ministry to the Latvian Central Bank could not be used to pay allowances to Russian servicemen because Russia's money was tied up in various technical credits.

Sergey Zotov described as a ploy the Latvian parliament's decision to postpone the consideration of a law on the temporary presence of Russian military servicemen on Latvia's territory until the first round of negotiations produced some results, while he called Boris Yeltsin's statement quite timely. "The treaty on the legal protection of Russian servicemen was presented to the Latvian side more than six months ago but the Latvians never got around to considering it," S. Zotov stressed.

Japan Plans To Move Consulate From Nakhodka to Vladivostok

OW2904005593 Vladivostok Radiostantsiya Tikhiy Okean Maritime Network in Russian 0715 GMT 28 Apr 93

[From the "Pacific Ocean" Program]

[Text] A large delegation of the Japanese MOFA [Ministry of Foreign Affairs] is presently working in Maritime Kray. The main topic of meetings with representatives of the kray administration is the further development of goodneighborly relations and the relocation of the consulate general to Vladivostok from the Nakhodka free economic zone.

Sumio Kosaka, deputy chief of the department for work with foreign representatives of the Japanese MOFA, noted that Vladivostok, the major transport and business center in Russia's Far East, is becoming the center of great attention from potential partners among the countries of the Asian-Pacific region. The increasing number of visits by Japanese businessmen to Maritime Kray has become the most persuasive argument for making the coming move.

The question will be decided conclusively only after the signing of an intergovernmental agreement, but Japanese MOFA representatives are already looking for a suitable site for the consulate.

Shokhin, Gerashchenko Attend London EBRD Talks

PM2804191593 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Apr 93 First Edition p 3

[Aleksandr Krivopalov report: "Referendum Results Given Positive Reception by Western Businesspeople, Russian Federation Government Vice Premier A. Shokhin Has Stated in London"]

[Text] London—The results of the Russian referendum have become the main talking point in the British capital, Vice Premier A. Shokhin, who is visiting London, told your IZVESTIYA correspondent. He has been holding businesslike talks here.

"Everyone I have spoken with, representatives of international organizations, governments, banks, and the business community, are keen to know the referendum results. Practically nobody doubted that the president would win on the first question," A. Shokhin continued during an interview in London's Queen Elizabeth II Center, where the annual meeting of the European Bank of Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) finished last Tuesday. "But for many people it was agreeable to find out that the Russian Government had also received what basically amounted to a vote of confidence. And this despite all the complexity of our economic policy, the painfulness of many measures, and certain negative social consequences of these measures. Public support does not mean that we should pay not attention to these consequences."

The signal given by the referendum got a positive reception in London as evidence of the fact that Russia intends to continue its move toward integration into the international economic community. In A. Shokhin's opinion, any other outcome of the referendum would have increased uncertainty among our Western partners about the possibility of doing business with the Russians.

The Russian topic was also actively discussed during the EBRD meeting. Viktor Gerashchenko, leader of the Russian delegation, indicated among other things that as of the end of March the EBRD board had approved 10 projects on Russian territory. However, the total loans actually made available came to no more than 6.3 million ECU's [European Currency Units]. This is a very small sum and bears no comparison with forecasted participation by the bank in financing economic reforms in Russia that was discussed at G7 meetings in 1992 and 1993.

It is true, Gerashchenko admitted, that genuine difficulties have taken their toll during the initial phase of the work, as has "our own lack of preparation in presenting

the bank with proposals for projects that need financing, bearing in mind all the specific features and difficulties."

Incidentally, the European Bank is working on the basis of rules established by the World Bank. Specifically, this assumes that no bank shall, for example, offer better guarantee terms than the World Bank. According to

Shokhin, it has now proved possible to secure a situation whereby this rule does not apply to Russia for several years.

In addition, certain problems connected with provision of EBRD loans for oil projects in Russia have been resolved.

Political Issues

Presidential Council Meets in Kremlin 28 Apr

LD2804114093 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English
1131 GMT 28 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondents]

[Text] Moscow April 28 TASS—Russian President Boris Yeltsin is chairing a meeting of the Presidential Council which opened on Wednesday [28 April].

The agenda includes three items, according to Yeltsin: the political results of the referendum, the actions of Russian regions after the referendum, and the new constitution.

Rutskoy Stripped of Duties

LD2804155693

[Editorial Report] Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian at 1406 GMT on 28 April, in a three-minute report for Mayak's "Panorama" program, correspondent Yuliy Semenov outlines the proceedings at today's Presidential Council session. He describes the general praise expressed regarding the referendum results and says: "Most of the discussion was about the president's possible actions. Not everything was revealed to us journalists, but the president's strategy will now be more decisive and more consistent. It is based, nonetheless, on legal methods of action above all. Priority is being given to the drawing up and adoption of a new constitution, and evidently a whole series of draft laws will be proposed and decrees signed.

"These might be the stages of development: The president makes every effort to act in conjunction with the Supreme Soviet and Congress, but if there is no good-will from that side, he will have to act independently on some issues.

"Then there were some specific points. Mayak may have reported this, or perhaps not. The situation regarding Vice President Rutskoy was discussed here. We know that he is no longer in charge of agricultural issues. Well, the president has signed a directive—we were told this at the council session—to the effect that the interdepartmental commission for combatting crime is also being taken out of the Rutskoy's charge. Thus, the vice president who, in accordance with his position is supposed to carry out certain presidential instructions, is, at the moment, without any permanent instructions and is, so to speak, in a kind of vacuum."

Semenov concludes his report by saying: "Furthermore, the issue of the possibility of elections in the future was also discussed. In the view of experts on the Presidential Council, the fact that a majority of the turnout was gained at the referendum removes the issue of early presidential elections for the foreseeable future. The question of elections of deputies, on the contrary, remains on the agenda because, after all, the number of those who voted for the early end of deputies' powers is very, very great. It was,

actually, the largest figure that could have been expected from the overall number of voters."

Referendum, Rutskoy Discussed

LD2804214293 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1700 GMT 28 Apr 93

[By correspondent Igor Minayev; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The Presidential Council was in session in the Kremlin today. Discussion of the results of the nationwide voting was held behind closed doors. Our camera crew was allowed into the room for only a few minutes. We shall therefore be relying in this account of the council's work mainly on the statements by the president's press secretary.

[Minayev] The meeting was opened by Boris Yeltsin.

[Begin Yeltsin recording] I thank those who worked energetically prior to the referendum for their work and I congratulate everyone on the victory. [end recording]

The president proposed a three-point agenda consisting of the political results of the referendum, action programs at the federal and regional levels, and the new constitution. In accordance with existing practice the meeting was held behind closed doors.

Informing journalists about its outcome, Vyacheslav Kostikov, the president's press secretary, noted that Boris Yeltsin was pleased by the results of the referendum. The president's strategy should be directed toward the speediest possible adoption of the new constitution. That was the conclusion reached by the council's members.

In the press secretary's view the referendum presupposes the need for parliament to rescind a number of laws directed at limiting the role of the president and the government. Vyacheslav Kostikov drew the conclusion that the president is now fully entitled to speak on behalf of the new Russia, while the Soviets have lost this right.

[Announcer] Analyzing the results of the meeting the press secretary stated that the Supreme Soviet has gone on to the attack. One of its main blows was directed at the policy of privatization. For this reason it is no coincidence that the attention of the parliamentarians is now focused on Anatoliy Chubays. The Presidential Council members today asked Boris Yeltsin to support Anatoliy Chubays.

Discussing the question of Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy, many members of the council expressed the view that he has shown himself to be a leader among those who oppose reform. The president's dismissal of Aleksandr Rutskoy from being in charge of agricultural reforms and today from being in charge of the commission on combating corruption shows that the vice president is now in a political vacuum. This was stated in an official ITAR-TASS report.

Yeltsin Satisfied With Referendum

*LD2804211593 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service
in English 1800 GMT 28 Apr 93*

[Text] The Russian president, Boris Yeltsin, says he's satisfied with the results of the referendum. He believes that one of the main objectives now is the adoption of a new constitution. A presidential spokesman, Vyacheslav Kostikov, made the statement as he briefed journalists on Wednesday's session of the Presidential Council, which discussed the results of the referendum and the political strategy in the current situation.

According to the early returns from the referendum, the president received support from 58 percent of those who went to the polls.

Kostikov said that the president had received what he described as new and very strong legitimacy. The presidential spokesman said that neither the Supreme Soviet nor the Congress of Peoples' Deputies had either juridical or constitutional right to interfere in the president's area of competence.

Apart from the adoption of a new constitution, there is another major program, the protection of the privatization program from attack from the opponents of reforms.

The Presidential Council asked President Yeltsin to resolutely support the chief of that program, Anatoliy Chubays, and the part of the government which embodied the radical dynamics of reforms.

Yeltsin Meets With Expanded Session of Government

Session Previewed

*PM2704150193 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI
in Russian 27 Apr 93 p 1*

[Yuriy Rytov "Opinion" article: "What Is State Regulation. Executive Gets Chance To Sharply Reinforce Its Positions. How May Reform Course Be Adjusted in New Conditions?"]

[Text] We will most likely hear the answer to this question the day after tomorrow at an enlarged government session. I would remind you for the time being that [Prime Minister] Viktor Chernomyrdin has spoken repeatedly of the need to adjust the reform course. In his opinion, in addition to financial stabilization (the main aim of the Gaydar team), there must be structural reorganization of the economy, strengthening of the social sphere, and application of state economic regulators.

It is the premier's last aim—to introduce state regulation of the economy—that is of particular interest. What can it mean?

It is obvious to everyone now that the hope that the economy would automatically regulate itself, a hope that sustained the first phase of reform, has not materialized.

Enterprises adapted to the market not by seeking the most effective forms of production, those essential to consumers, but by raising prices, seeking more advantageous customers, and other methods in the sphere of circulation.

In short, state regulation of the state sector of the economy is now an objective necessity. The question is only what forms it will take and whether it will once again give rise to diktat by the Ministry of the Economy and sectoral ministries in the state sector. Some experts, in particular, are pointing out the possibility of rigid state control over the fulfillment of prescribed deliveries of output and implementation of work to meet state needs. The creation of an integral system of state enterprise defining precise borders within which state enterprises can conduct an autonomous financial policy is also quite possible.

An important question has been included on the agenda for the enlarged government session scheduled for 29 April: the question of the results of the Cabinet's work during the first quarter and the tasks for the coming period.

I think that two problems may take center stage when this question is discussed: financial organization and the further course of privatization. Cabinet members will hardly take an unequivocal approach to these problems.

The tough financial policy proclaimed by Boris Fedorov has, after all, ended up fuzzy following the president's latest edicts and the government's decrees designed to strengthen the social sphere. A real threat of hyperinflation has arisen, which, quite understandably, will make it extremely difficult to stabilize production and will deal a painful blow to the purse of ordinary citizens.

As for privatization, a move to selective forms of privatization—immediate flotation and state support for the most important and promising enterprises—may in all probability also give rise to plenty of disputes.

But the latest government appointments, especially Oleg Lobov's confirmation to key posts in the economic bloc of ministries, force one to think that state regulation of the economy will follow the maximum line.

Yeltsin Presents Constitution

*LD2904124993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English
1115 GMT 29 Apr 93*

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent]

[Text] Moscow April 29 TASS—Russian President Boris Yeltsin on Thursday [29 April] turned over the text of the new draft constitution of the Russian Federation to representatives of the Federation's subjects.

The Federal Treaty is part and parcel of the draft Russian Constitution whose seven basic principles are its being a constitution of human rights and liberties, of full-fledged federal state, presidential democratic republic, strong legislative authority, independent and

fully-fledged law, civic patriotism and the constitution's stable character, precluding the possibility of its arbitrary change.

The Constitution ensures full constitutional rights to subjects of the Russian Federation, guarantees to every nation and ethnic group free implementation of national sovereignty, national and cultural originality and development in accordance with historic traditions. The state guarantees to all peoples of the Russian Federation the right to preserve the mother tongue and create the conditions for its study and development.

In accordance with the Constitution, the system of state power is established in the federation's subjects on the basis of the provisions on people's power, republican form of rule, separation of authorities and other provisions for a democratic, rule-of-law secular state.

The Russian Constitution is the constitution of a presidential democratic republic. Under the draft constitution, the head of state is president of the Russian Federation elected by the whole people. President is the main guarantor of indivisibility and integrity of the state, integrity of the state authority and the exercise of constitutional rights of man and citizen. The Constitution clearly defines the limits of presidential powers and envisages guarantees ensuring the exercise of presidential powers in the framework of the constitution and law.

The Russian Constitution is a constitution of a strong legislative authority. The existence of presidential authority does not deny the exercise of consistent parliamentarism and the principle of the separation of authorities. Quite the contrary, it ensures them. The Constitution guarantees a high status of representative authorities—two-chamber federal assembly (parliament) and municipal bodies. Representatives of subjects of the federation are elected to one of the parliamentary chambers—the Council of the Federation. Deputies elected in territorial districts on the basis of uniform norms of representation are elected to the other chamber, the state дума. Legislative activity is the exclusive right of the federal assembly.

The executive power is exercised by the government which consists of its chairman and federal ministers.

Recognising that the law is unchangeable, the Constitution ensures independence of the court—constitutional, civil and arbitration courts.

The Russian Constitution is the basis for local self-government. The conduct of coordinated federal policy goes hand in hand with the principle of ensuring free regional development: local self-government is the exclusive right of municipal bodies. Municipal self-government operates beyond the limits of state authority and is independent of it.

The new Russian Constitution, recognising the intrinsic value and uniqueness of every human life, being based on the best historic traditions of the Russian statehood

and achievements of the world civilisation, ensures lofty dignity and human rights and liberties protected by law and independent court.

The full text of the draft new Russian Constitution will be published.

Calls For Examination of Constitution

LD2904080793 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 0630 GMT 29 Apr 93

[Text] In the Kremlin today the Russian President Boris Yeltsin addressed a meeting of the Council of Heads of Republics within the Russian Federation. Regarding the draft of the new constitution he said, in particular:

[Begin Yeltsin recording] I would like to call your attention to the following. First of all, this draft is composite. It has integrated all the best from all the constitutional drafts that have had a political resonance lately. Second, it is, if one could use the expression, partially in force due to the Federative Treaty, which has been incorporated in full in the draft constitution as a separate chapter, as the subjects of the Federation wanted and demanded.

Third, speaking in the strictest sense, it is only a draft of, possibly, a draft, because it is precisely from you that I expect, in the first place, not only remarks, but proposals as well. It would be even better if there were concrete formulations. It is precisely you, the subjects of the Federation, or the representatives of the subjects of the Federation, that must make their contribution to creating the constitution of the Russian Federation. Remarks and proposals must be submitted as quickly as possible.

The time period is limited to 20 May. It would be good to finalize the draft and then convene, well—what should I call it—a constitutional conference, or a constitutional meeting, to examine the draft, and to nominate two representatives from each subject of the Federation to this constitutional conference or meeting. You yourself will decide what to call them, and to nominate them, elect or delegate them—that is your business.

On my part I will send several lawyers, Russia's top professionals, to this conference, and it would be good to have an agreed version of the text by the end of May or the beginning of June. [end recording]

Seeks Contributions to Constitution

LD2904073093 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0653 GMT 29 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondents Ivan Ivanov and Genadiy Talalayev]

[Text] Moscow April 29 TASS—Addressing a meeting of the Russian heads of republics council in the Kremlin today, President Yeltsin offered the subjects of the Russian Federation to contribute to the finalisation of

the draft of the new constitution and to submit their concrete proposals before May 20. He also moved to convene a constitutional assembly or a constitutional conference to discuss the draft constitution, attended by two representatives from each subject of the federation. "It would be fine if we could have an agreed version of the draft constitution by the end of May," the president said.

After congratulating the participants of the meeting on the referendum's success, the president stressed that "the fact that we were able to hold this referendum practically on the entire territory of the Russian Federation shows that we are united and that our federalism is working". At the same time, Yeltsin admitted that the turnout and results of the voting were different in various regions of Russia due to differing local conditions.

The president stressed the importance of the fact that the people had on the whole backed the ongoing policy of economic reforms. At the same time, he noted that less than 50 per cent of the population had voted for this economic policy in several regions of the country, which testifies to the presence of political reasons for such a result of the vote on this question. Yeltsin mentioned among those political reasons the fact that the "Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic has been replaced peacefully by a Russian Federation. Our state has changed... Its social system and has reaffirmed its confidence for the first time as such in the president and his economic policy".

Yeltsin also stressed that the new Russia needed a new constitution: "We must go ahead and live according to new standards". He said that he would submit the draft of the new constitution to the meeting today.

Calls For Continued Economic Reform

LD2904090293 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 0800 GMT 29 Apr 93

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Opening an expanded government session in the Kremlin today, with the participation of the leaders of all republics and subjects of the Russian Federation, Boris Yeltsin noted that the session was taking place in a fundamentally new political situation. The citizens of Russia confirmed their trust in the president and the government in the referendum and, what is the main thing, lent their support to the policy of in-depth, radical reforms pursued by us since 1992. This, the president emphasized, was the sensation of the referendum, a big surprise from the Russian people to the opponents of reforms.

[Begin Yeltsin recording] Everyone ought to understand that the president, the government, and the policy of reforms alike are now under the protection of the people. Decisions that run counter to the will of the people—no matter who adopts them—are no longer liable to be implemented and ought to be repealed. The Congress

and the Supreme Soviet must decide: either they support the course of the president and the government, or these bodies enter into a confrontation, this time with the people themselves. The time for demagogy and for making political capital out of the mandate of trust of the electorate has ended. At the same time, the support for the reforms policy should not in any way be a reason to live in a fool's paradise. We have no right to close our eyes to errors in our work. [end recording]

In his program speech, the president called for most decisive measures to be taken to form a socially oriented market economy, to consolidate the first signs of stabilization which, as he noted, are already beginning to make themselves felt. It is only upon this basis that conditions can be created for a steady increase in the standard of life of the citizens. People, said Boris Yeltsin, should see in their every day life why we are carrying out these reforms. Harsh centralism has outlived itself, said the president.

The new regional strategy of the Russian state, which is based in part on the revival of the pre-revolutionary local administration [zemstvo] system, is intended to be an important instrument.

[Begin Yeltsin recording] Is it not time to bring order here, to give preference to those regions that have moved further forward on the reforms? Let us agree on this: those who are not advancing reforms should not come here to Moscow to beg. We will support those who are advancing reforms. We will support those who are proceeding well with privatization. Look at Nizhny Novgorod. [end recording]

At the expanded government session, two issues were considered: the results of socioeconomic development of Russia in the first quarter of this year and the main directions of regional policy. A big report on the first issue was delivered by Council of Ministers Chairman Viktor Chernomyrdin.

Addresses Meeting

LD2904115793 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1025 GMT 29 Apr 93

[Address by President Boris Yeltsin to the expanded session of government in the Kremlin in Moscow on 29 April—recorded]

[Text] We are opening an expanded session of the government. Today's session is being held in a fundamentally new political situation. The preliminary results of the Russia-wide referendum have been summed up. I would like to use this opportunity to express thanks to the citizens of Russia who took part in the referendum and to all who worked to stage it. Among those taking part in today's session are quite a few people who have done a great deal to make the referendum happen. I thank you for making the referendum take place in an organized and calm manner.

Briefly about the results of the referendum. The results will be analyzed in greater depth after the final results are promulgated. At the referendum the citizens of Russia confirmed their confidence in the president and the government, but the main result is the Russian people's support for the policy of in-depth, radical changes pursued by the president, the government, and us here since 1992. This is, as it were, the sensation of the referendum, a big surprise prepared for the opponents of reforms by the Russian people. Our task now is to justify the trust which has been placed in us.

We worked for almost 18 months under conditions of fierce opposition from the congress and the Supreme Soviet. It became more and more fierce, and in recent months a course of all but political destruction of both the president and the present government and of total blocking of our economic course was taken.

Everyone should understand that the president and the government and the policy of reform are now under the protection of the people. Decisions which run counter to the will of the people, no matter who adopts them, are no longer liable to be implemented and ought to be rescinded. The congress and the Supreme Soviet must decide: either they support the course of the president and the government or these bodies enter into confrontation, this time with the people itself. The time for demagoguery and for making political capital out of the mandate of trust of the electorate has ended. At the same time, support for the policy of reform should not in any way be a reason to live in a fool's paradise. We have no right to close our eyes to errors in our work. We are obliged to take the most decisive measures to achieve the aims of our economic transformations and to shape a socially-oriented market economy.

I see the results of the referendum as a direct instruction from the people and we do not have the right not to carry it out. The main task is to consolidate the first signs of stabilization, which are beginning to appear. Only on that basis can the conditions be created for a steady increase in citizens' standard of living. People have to see in their daily lives what we are implementing these reforms for.

Developing market relations has never been an aim in itself in the economic policy of the president and the government. It is the only possible way of reviving Russia and is already yielding certain positive results. A slump in output has been observed since last autumn. In the first quarter it virtually stopped. On our actions today depends what is to become of this unstable equilibrium: the start of the economic revival of Russia or just a brief stop on the way.

Last summer we had already disturbed the equilibrium of the economy with a torrent of unsecured funds and many millions of credits.

This prolonged the crisis by six months. We have no right to repeat such a mistake today so there is a single conclusion to be drawn. A tough credit, monetary, and

financial policy must be endured. Irresponsible, inflationary financing of production and social programs is a ruinous path. A lot is being said these days about loss of control and the collapse of the system of economic management. It is time to sort this question out as well. The old instruments of control, ones like the right to dictate orders and directives, to apportion centralized funds down the telephone, are receding into the past—forever I hope—but their place is being taken by new economic instruments such as loans, taxes, and the entire range of financial and structural policy. The majority of economic managers and other leaders have already proved in practice that they are capable of using these instruments.

During the last 18 months the reforms have won convinced and powerful supporters. They associate not just the distant but also the immediate future of Russia and its citizens with their success. The long-term strategy of our policy is to form an alliance between the executive authorities and Russian entrepreneurs and industrialists, who are finding their place in the market. Despite all the inconsistency of individual decisions, the government's overall policy of supporting industry and entrepreneurship remains unchanged. Evidently, it is no coincidence that many of the country's businessmen are, on the whole, expressing confidence in the executive authorities.

I would like to dwell on certain specific aspects of economic policy. The land reform is the paramount issue. Let us, once and for all, establish what it means: a real transfer to citizens of land which is federally owned. Proper state support for all producers of food, including state enterprises, collective farms, and private farmers, is vitally important. This is not the traditional dependence which we knew in the past. The fact is that efficient farms, which make a real contribution to supplying the food market, ought to receive tax advantages, targeted loans, and other types of support. This also applies to the new private farmers, to everybody who is starting work on the land thanks to the privatization of federal land stocks.

Financial measures which will help people acquire small-holdings must be adopted. Organizational steps which will make it possible for all citizens to gain access to land must be taken. Such steps would protect them from arbitrariness and local opposition.

The carrying out of privatization is the most important problem. An active state policy on the privatization vouchers' market is essential. The volume of state property sold off for privatization vouchers must be expanded. The volume of money—what is meant is securities—must be expanded. The list of state owned facilities which are sold off entirely for privatization vouchers must be expanded.

It is important to ensure that privatized enterprises have normal conditions of work. What is meant here, first and foremost, is to set up mechanisms of interaction between the privatized sector and the state sector, concerning, above all, the issues of supplies and sales, taxation, and

attracting investments. Where privatization proceeds poorly, it is, clearly, proof that there is local opposition to reforms, opposition to changing Russia's social system. It is our prime duty to ensure, at long last, genuinely equal conditions for enterprises however owned.

The currency policy: the instability of the ruble's currency exchange rates has now become one of the main factors affecting investment. The constant decline of the ruble has become one of the strongest aspects among the psychological irritants of Russian society. A stage-by-stage stabilization of the currency exchange rate is acutely necessary. The rate would thus become one of the fulcrums of our general financial stabilization.

The surmounting of the investment crisis: there is no doubt that centralized state investments will still continue to play some part in our economy. The utilization of these huge sums currently remains extremely ineffective. The time has come to underpin the distribution of centralized investments by a commercial basis, account having been taken of economic efficiency and the priorities of structural policy.

An enterprise should nonetheless be provided with access to centralized investments under equal competitive conditions, regardless of the form of ownership. A single principle should apply to everybody: a project that is effective and well-grounded and corresponds to the tasks of the government's structural policy brings the right to investments and to credits. The issue of privileges is a very sore one. There is no basic procedure here nor uniform rules for all. Bureaucrats abuse their office, hiding behind the term as an exception. The government has still not introduced procedures regarding personnel and for Russian enterprise. This means real chains, the preservation of the roots of the administrative system, which will without fail try again to stifle free enterprise in our country. Strict regulation of the procedure for offering privileges is needed in all spheres, including in foreign economic activity. Clearly outlined rules for passing decisions on economic questions should be drawn up as soon as possible and these should be obligatory for all bodies of executive power. We have been talking about this for a long time; unfortunately very little has been done.

Special attention should be given to the problem of growing unemployment. There should be employment guarantees for workers in state enterprises which are declared bankrupt for the period of their financial revitalization. We need urgently to start work on setting up state and stimulating private systems for professionally retraining the unemployed and employing them in priority branches of the economy. It is time we started organizing public work, first and foremost in the area of housing and road construction. The small business sphere should in the near future be based on registration rather than on the necessity of applying for permission, the immediate measures involved being tax benefits for small businesses, the creation of enterprise support funds

and special insurance funds to encourage private initiative in this area, and measures providing organizational, judicial, and consultative assistance for citizens setting up a small enterprise.

Clearly some kind of document needs to be adopted on this. The market economy in developed countries shows us how huge concerns rely on tens of thousands of small firms. This is the main guarantee for stability of the market economy. In our circumstances, too, there is the basis for such cooperation. The government should draft proposals to stimulate cooperation of this kind.

One of the principal reasons for the slump in production, and the consequent fall in living standards enjoyed by Russian citizens, is the excessive taxation burden imposed on commodity producers. There have been quite a few promises to reduce tax rates. A few things have been done in this direction but the tax burden remains heavy. In preparing proposals for a review of taxes, not only must the interests of commodity producers be reflected to the greatest extent possible, but the support of entrepreneurs must be secured for decisions which are taken. Maybe both sides should sit down for talks and find mutually acceptable solutions. It is important to introduce real incentives for the maintenance and development of production in priority sectors, above all export sectors and ones which supply the consumer market.

Economic legislation: the most important objective is to simplify all existing procedures. It is essential to provide rapid and effective protection, through the judicial system, for the economic rights of both entrepreneurs, employees, and all those involved in economic disputes. We have taken only the first steps towards the creation of a system of effective safeguards for property, both entrepreneurial and personal. A great deal of work still needs to be done in this area.

Today, as never before, Russia needs a stable political system and for the rights and obligations of the subjects of the Russian Federation to be defined. These fundamental issues can be tackled only through the adoption of a new Russian constitution. This is the main condition for the continuation of economic transformations and the revival of our industrial and scientific potential and for the achievement of stability in politics, the social sphere, and in the economy. Representatives of the subjects of the Federation received the draft constitution today. It will now be the subject of intensive study and comment.

We will consider them as attentively as it is possible to do. Everyone knows that rigid centralism has outlived itself as a form of Russian statehood. Everyone knows that the country is gripped by a sense of anxiety for the integrity of the Russian state. Will it not suffer the same fate as the Soviet Union? These fears are justified but exaggerated. Our state has stood since time immemorial on feelings of patriotism, on feelings of being a great motherland. It cannot be torn asunder, oblast by oblast,

autonomy by autonomy. Political separatism has no roots among the people of Russia. It is pure politicking.

At the same time, it is clear that synchronized progress of the reforms cannot be achieved by the center from the top through the Russian regions. Regional development of the country is increasingly passing beyond the traditional central control. This creates a mass of problems. The proportion of centralized investments is still great, but these are being distributed virtually without looking at the regions. A number of republics, krais, and oblasts enjoy the notorious special payments. Support from the center goes to those who ask the loudest, or, as they say, have contacts in Moscow. But at the same time, they are frequently unable to make use of the money they have demanded from Moscow.

Is it not time to bring order here, to give preference to those regions which have moved further forward on the reforms? Let's agree on this: those who are not advancing the reforms should not come here to Moscow to beg. Those who are advancing the reforms we will support. We will support those who are proceeding well with privatization. Look at Nizhny Novgorod.

We will never solve this or any other problems unless we reorganize our whole state practice on the basis of the principle of federalism. The Federation Treaty was the first decisive step in this direction. Now it is time for specific work to put the Treaty into practice. This work has also to be launched in the regions. The prime task for the federal authorities is to create a fundamentally new regional strategy of the Russian state. Even now the principles on which it should be built are clear: first, recognition that major distinctions between regions are impermissible; second, a policy of cooperation between regions and of using to the maximum their potential and diversity for the good of all parts of the country; third, a policy of using regulation rather than orders. The main aim of such a regional strategy is also clear in outline. It is, above all, the prosperity of citizens. It is territorial justice for the sake of which no single region should gain any, I stress, unjustified privileges. It is the integrity of the state as a matter of particular concern for the central authorities.

Federalism has one further important aspect which is often forgotten. It exists at the level of towns, villages, and administrative rayons. Here, Russian statehood possesses the invaluable experience of the *zemstvo* system [19th century system of local administration] which in its day gained recognition as an indisputable attainment and achievement in state practice. The time has come to remember it, in all earnestness. Let me reiterate that the new regional strategy of the Russian state is not aimed at overcoming the diversity of regions for the sake of simplifying management of them from the center. On the contrary, the point of it is to preserve the special features of the Russian regions as invaluable potential for the country's development and as a guarantee of its integrity.

I am convinced that a sensible, well thought-out regional strategy will help to transform all the various Russian regions into a source of stabilization of Russian society. Esteemed participants in the meeting, there is another problem which I would like to bring up. The people have expressed support for our reform policy, but it is no secret that far from everybody within the ranks of the executive branch is happy about such support. We do not have the time or energy to spend on some kind of internal struggle with opponents of the reform course, but we cannot go on tolerating resistance from within either. We must rid ourselves of those who are not traveling the same road as us and conduct a more resolute personnel policy. This task has now been entrusted to Vladimir Filippovich [Shumeyko], first deputy chairman [of the Council of Ministers]. We have made quite a few mistakes in this area and they must be rectified more boldly.

Finally, the government meeting today is for the first time attended as heads of administrations by Zubov, Krasnoyarsk kray; Surat, Amur oblast; Lodkin, Bryansk oblast, and Glushenkov from Smolensk oblast. They were elected on 25 April and we congratulate them. Thank you.

Chernomyrdin Addresses Meeting

LD2904104493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1000 GMT 29 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow April 29 TASS—The Russian Government's main aim is to achieve national accord in the economic policy. Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin said this in the Kremlin on Thursday [29 April], delivering a 50-minute report at a cabinet meeting on Russia's social and economic development in the first quarter of 1993, on current tasks and the implementation of the cabinet's plan for the economic reform in 1993.

The Russian premier said the referendum showed that Russians support the course of reform pursued by the government. "We have been granted a credit of confidence which we should use for work aimed at the stabilisation of the socio-economic situation in the country", Chernomyrdin said. He described the present economic situation as a "precarious balance, stagnation of the crisis". He said that the government should take more vigorous and determined actions to stabilise the situation.

Chernomyrdin cited numerous data about the state of the Russian economy in the first quarter of 1993. The budget deficit is rising. It made up over ten per cent of the gross domestic product in January-March. Credits are covered mostly by emission of money. The lowering of the output of fuel, oil by 15 per cent and coal by 10 per cent, is the reason for particular anxiety. Agricultural production is dwindling. The number of cattle continues to decrease.

Among top priorities of the government's economic policy for near future Chernomyrdin mentioned social support for the population, the effort to get inflation in check, implementation of the privatisation programme, improvement of the management of the state sector of the economy, selective support for promising productions and ensurance of Russia's integrity on a basis of the Federal Treaty.

To combat inflation, the Russian Government will be aiming to arrest the growth of money supply, reduce the term of payments between enterprises, reform the budget system to reduce the budget deficit, perfect the tax system, Chernomyrdin said.

Among the government's tasks for May-June, Chernomyrdin mentioned arresting inflation at any cost and the introduction of rigid guides for the monetary policy, solution by the end of June of the matter of the freeing of prices of energy carriers, solution of the problem of payments, development of the system of state regulation of economic processes and a number of others.

Shakhray Calls For Strengthening Economy

*LD2904111193 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1057
GMT 29 Apr 93*

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Sergey Podyapolskiy]

[Text] Moscow April 29 TASS—The strengthening of Russian economy, the development of federalism and local self-government must become at this stage top priorities of regional policy in the Russian Federation. Sergey Shakhray, Russian deputy premier, said this on Thursday [29 April], addressing a meeting of the Russian cabinet. He said that achieving these priorities can preserve Russia as an integral state, create conditions for a "normal market economy" and ensure comparatively identical living standards of the population in various regions.

Shakhray said the results of the referendum showed unevenness of the pace and effectiveness of transformations in regions. He regards this as another reason why the referendum was needed. Taking into account these indications, the government should give special attention to regions where less than 50 per cent of the poll expressed support for the Russian Government's social and economic course. He believes the government should work out special programmes to intensify the process of reforms in these regions.

The deputy premier declared for a more effective quest of the forms of the interaction of the centre and subjects of the federation. He believes there should be representatives of regional and interregional associations on the collegiums of federal ministries. "It took the government too long to embark on cooperation with such associations", Shakhray said. He noted that the activity of

precisely such associations weakens disintegration processes. Vigorous work should be continued jointly with representatives of subjects of the federation in Moscow, Shakhray believes.

The deputy premier also noted the importance of personnel for coping with regional policy. "It is necessary to restore the exchange of certified personnel at federal level", he said.

Coalition of Reforms Demands More Resolute Actions

*LD2804161893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1551
GMT 28 Apr 93*

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Lyudmila Yermakova]

[Text] Moscow April 28 TASS—Members of the Parliamentary Coalition of Reforms believe it is necessary to meet Russian President Boris Yeltsin on Friday [30 April] to discuss the tactics to be used after the referendum in order to strengthen the president's victory. At a meeting held here in Moscow members of the coalition voiced the opinion that "tough, precise and prompt actions should be taken so as not to repeat the mistake of being passive in August, 1991. We should go ahead, rather than wait for something to happen," said Aleksey Surkov, one of the leaders of the coalition.

Deputy Viktor Sheynis, describing the people's support of the socio-political policy as the main victory in the referendum, emphasised that Boris Yeltsin "has the right to realize any resolutions in this sphere taking no heed of the parliament's objections." At the same time he suggested "a realistic approach to the situation without building up tension, since many people seem to lose their nerve."

Some deputies disagreed with him demanding tougher measures. For example, member of the coalition, Vladimir Podoprigora, suggested asking the security department "to investigate anti-popular activities of some deputies."

Members of the coalition decided to appeal to people's deputies asking them to display courage and a noble attitude, to assess the role of the parliament, "which has become a destabilising force in society, from positions of self-criticism and work out a soft way of transfer to political reforms." One of the ways suggested was the self-dissolution of the congress.

Rutskoy Warns Against Mafia Seeking Political Power

*AU2804150593 Berlin BERLINER ZEITUNG in
German 24-25 Apr 93 p 3*

[Interview with Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy by "journalists of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA exclusively for BERLINER ZEITUNG"; place and date not given: "Mafiosi Seeking Political Power"]

[Text] Russian Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy has warned against tightening links between state structures and the Russian mafia. After his appearance in the Supreme Soviet, reporters of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA conducted the following interview with him exclusively for BERLINER ZEITUNG.

[BERLINER ZEITUNG] Do you really see the danger that Russia might soon be controlled by the mafia?

[Rutskoy] Those who are doing business in the "black economy" and are making enormous profits from the collapse of the state, are now seeking political power. The recently elected president of Kalmykia and people's deputy of the Russian Federation, Kirsan Ilyumshinov, made 14 billion rubles in illegal profits through the sale of wool and oil products. I do not know why the Security Ministry, which is familiar with the case, does not do anything.

[BERLINER ZEITUNG] After your speech in Parliament you were stripped of your personal protection. Do you feel threatened?

[Rutskoy] Since, in my capacity as chairman of the commission for the struggle against corruption, I started to collect material on abuse of authority at the highest level, I can feel that high-ranking personalities take a great interest in my person. Therefore, each time I leave my office in the Kremlin, I issue a warning through the listening system: The safe is closed in the Afghan way—by a hand grenade with released safety-pin.

[BERLINER ZEITUNG] To what extent are the rumors justified that speak of the unlimited power of those who are close to the president?

[Rutskoy] The president is deliberately given wrong information. I know that the president is working on half of his speeches himself. He prepares the text, but then others write such nonsense into these speeches that he simply makes a fool of himself.

[BERLINER ZEITUNG] What is your personal view of the president?

[Rutskoy] I recognize that he is older and more experienced than I am. However, I am against those who cheat him and make him a hostage of their damaging ideas. I voted for him as early as 1989, as a student at the academy of the general staff, when the current defense minister could not understand why I declared my solidarity with this democrat. In August 1991 I was not hiding in the bunker. Now I have simply been separated from the president.

Referendum Issues

Khasbulatov Backs Deputy Elections in Certain Cities

PM2804154193 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Apr 93 p 1

[Aleksandr Ilin report: "Ruslan Khasbulatov: 'Vote Does Not Give Right to Arbitrariness'"]

[Text] Ruslan Khasbulatov, chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, has expressed gratitude to PRAVDA journalists for the newspaper's objective coverage of problems connected with the past referendum. Concerning its results, Khasbulatov voiced the conviction that the referendum results give no one the right to unconstitutional actions, and the Supreme Soviet will be able to counter possible attempts of this kind on the part of the presidential team. It must not be forgotten that a minority of Russians who have the right to vote expressed confidence in the president and his policy. The opinions of the speaker of the Russian parliament and of PRAVDA journalists also coincided on another issue: In Moscow, St. Petersburg, and Yekaterinburg, where a majority voted for early elections of Russian Federation people's deputies, it would be worth holding such elections. This would only strengthen the body of deputies.

Popov: Referendum Vote Indicates Support for Reforms

LD2804145893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1339 GMT 28 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Oleg Velichko]

[Text] Moscow April 28 TASS—At the referendum people of Russia have supported the president and reforms Gavriil Popov, chairman of the Russian Democratic Reforms Movement, told reporters on Wednesday [28 April]. This indicates that possible attempts by the Russian Congress of People's Deputies to impeach the president should be regarded as a coup of antistate conspiracy. The referendum showed that the executive authority has been supported by independent Russia, he said.

At the same time, Popov deplored the fact that the Russian referendum has not "knocked down the opposition". He believes the reason is that the new draft constitution has not been popularised enough. Another thing is that the specific economic programme is lacking, which is seen from certain passivity of business structures.

The idea of convening a constituent assembly is widespread among democratic politicians. This idea was expressed at the meeting with reporters again. The Russian Democratic Reform Movement suggests that a consultative constitutional assembly be held at once to adopt a new constitution. The future consultative constitutional assembly, according to the Democratic

Reform Movement, should be convened on behalf of the Russian president or a round-table conference. It should consist of 300 representatives. One hundred of them should represent the authorities, one hundred political parties and movements, and one hundred—public organisations.

Out of the 100 representatives of the authorities, 30 should be suggested by the president, 30 by the parliament and 40 by subjects of the federation.

Official Says Referendum Strengthened Council of Ministers

LD2804153993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1352
GMT 28 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Sergey Podyapolskiy]

[Text] Moscow April 28 TASS—"The results of the referendum have strengthened the positions of the Cabinet of Ministers beyond expectation and gave the government an opportunity to work calmly for a continuous period of time, being independent of controversies of internal political struggle," a high-ranking official of the Russian Council of Ministers told ITAR-TASS on Wednesday.

According to the official, taking into account the results of the voting on the second and fourth questions of the referendum, the present deputies' corps is not entitled to raise the question of the government's resignation. Theoretically, until the elections of a new deputies' corps are held, the prime minister's voluntary resignation can be the only ground for the cabinet reshuffling.

The official admitted that the results of the voting on the second question have surpassed the most optimistic forecasts. The formulation of this question put the cabinet in the focus of the conflict between the two branches of power. If the referendum failed to give support to the socio-economic course by a majority vote, the leadership of the parliament might raise the question of the resignation of the government as a means of putting pressure on it. Therefore, questions of winning support for Chernomyrdin's government from the "Civic Union" were studied before the referendum.

Now that the government received the mandate of people's confidence, the Cabinet of Ministers will come down to the realization of its plans. In the near future, partial redistribution of powers between vice prime ministers and some cabinet reshuffling can be expected. According to unofficial reports, First Vice Prime Minister Oleg Lobov can be put in charge of defence issues. Other resignations in the cabinet of ministers are possible as well, ITAR-TASS learned from the same source.

Yeltsin Aide on Early Referendum Results

PM2804123593 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28
Apr 93 First Edition pp 1,2

[Interview with Presidential Administration Chief Sergey Filatov by V. Kononenko; place and date not given: "Sergey Filatov: The Congress Should Stop Flaunting Its Super-Powers"]

[Text] The official results of the referendum will only be known in a few days' time. As is clear from the Central Electoral Commission's report, the preliminary results have brought President B. Yeltsin support which even the most optimistic predictions by sociological services did not promise him. This particularly relates to Russians' support for the course of profound economic reforms. It is likely that the executive branch of power did not rely fully on the system for calculating votes, which still operates under the control of the soviets, but organized its own channel for collecting and calculating information on the referendum in advance—through the services of heads of administration and the president's representatives at local level.

Thanks to their work, reports on the voting movements came into the Kremlin practically every hour and were summarized in a consolidated report. This was the source of the president's satisfaction with the way the referendum was proceeding, as press secretary V. Kostikov reported. Toward evening on 26 April, when the overall picture of the voting had become clear, the most active participants in the preparation for this all-Russian poll, including several vice premiers and the leaders of a number of presidential structures, met in Presidential Administration Chief S. Filatov's office. As your correspondent found out, the conference focused on political and legal evaluation of the Russians' support for their president, and also specific steps to put the people's will into effect. At the end of the conference S. Filatov shared his impressions with your IZVESTIYA correspondent.

"First of all," Sergey Aleksandrovich said, "according to reports we had received from 79 regions at 2000 hours on 26 April, 65 percent of the 98.7 million voters had voted. The results obtained were 60 percent in support of the president on the first question, 54 percent on the second, 31 percent on the third (here in relation to the electoral roll), and 44 percent on the fourth. Of course, this summary does not take into account approximately 7 million voters from the other nine regions, or the voting figures in the Army and in establishments abroad. Although we do know that the Army supported the president in a fitting way. In a word, the trend is clear and is scarcely reversible, regardless of the absence of official voting returns.

"The first conclusion that suggests itself from this information is that the Russian people have, in a way, reelected their president, and we would like the political struggle which is distracting all of us from carrying out reforms to end here. The opposition must be aware of the disposition of forces in society and take this basic factor

into account. Through the mood of society, the referendum has illuminated the utter inappropriateness of the disposition of forces among the deputies.

"Second, regardless of the deliberate confusion and substitution of concepts in the ballots, Russians understood the situation and consciously singled out the first question—on support for the president—from all the others. Hence the people's approval of the specific program of actions with which the president went to the referendum.

"To a certain extent you can consider Russians' strong support for the economic reforms carried out under the president's leadership unexpected. The given result is very telling. In their decrees, the Congress and Supreme Soviet repeatedly gave a sharply negative assessment of the measures designed to create a market economy. It now turns out that the people, on whose name many pseudo-patriots with mandates speculated endlessly, agree with the way the reforms were carried out in the difficult year of 1992. Naturally, the question arises: What is to happen to all those antireformist decrees?

"A referendum is not a consultative poll. It has legal consequences, and no other decisions on someone's part are needed to determine the course of society's advance. In a situation in which Russians have accepted the reforms they give the president a mandate for more resolute action by means of their support, and the representative power is obligated to provide the required legislative base for this."

[Kononenko] Sergey Aleksandrovich, we know about the president's promise after the 25th!...—in a word, as regards the resolute measures. What could these be like?

[Filatov] This is known in general terms. In the political sphere—the adoption of a new Constitution and the holding of new elections to a two-chamber parliament on the basis of it. In the economic sphere—a package of edicts and instructions on curbing inflation and aimed at a more efficient system of social protection for the population, but we will not run ahead of the president. He will soon inform us of his imminent actions himself.

[Kononenko] The answers to the third and fourth questions have no juridical consequences. Can we count on the great loyalty of the legislative corps toward the reforms?

[Filatov] It is true that the results of the ballot do not presuppose a lack of confidence in either the president or the Congress. However, the Congress should stop showing off its ultra-powers. The people did not confirm these powers.

[Kononenko] I would also like to know what you think about the position of the vice president, who clearly opposed the presidential team on the eve of the referendum.

[Filatov] I think that the time has come for the vice president to reach a decision himself.

[Kononenko] What can you say about the organization of the referendum as a whole?

[Filatov] It is worrying that, on the eve of the referendum, Central Electoral Commission Chairman V. Kazakov caused confusion in respect of the stamps and signatures on the ballots. As a result, instances did occur whereby people left the polling places without voting. They did not trust particular seals or stamps on the ballot, and they suspected the commission of manipulation.

The following coincidence is also worrying. V. Kazakov reported that the referendum did not stand in Chechnya and Tatarstan. We know that a deputy from one republic heads the Supreme Soviet, and a deputy from the other is his first vice chairman. Is this an accident, or are we seeing the aforesaid republics supporting their deputies, who are openly acting against the will of the people of Russian? The question is not an idle one, if only because the 25th was a question of a fateful choice for Russia.

Communists Complain of Media 'Indoctrination' of Voters

PM2804115193 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Apr 93 p 2

[Unattributed report: "Our People for Our Soviets"]

[Text] The RCWP [Russian Communist Workers Party] Central Committee Organizational Bureau has issued a statement on the results of the recent referendum. The document states that the preparations for the referendum and the actual voting 25 April were not in accordance with the laws of a democratic rule-of-law state. Tonnes of leaflets, posters, and brochures and television and radio programs in support of Yeltsin swamped the voters.

And yet, despite the monstrous psychological indoctrination, Yeltsin and his anti-people policy **did not secure a majority of the votes of the electorate included on the lists.** The RCWP Central Committee Organizational Bureau states that two-thirds of the electorate directly and secretly (by not reporting to the polling places) denied the president their trust.

The RCWP Central Committee Organizational Bureau believes that in the present situation it is necessary more actively to create soviets of workers, peasants, specialists, and employees in production collectives and to accelerate the collection of signatures in support of the Soviet Constitution.

Yeltsin Urged To 'Radicalize' Reforms

PM2804152593 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 28 Apr 93 p 1

[Lyubov Tsukanova commentary: "Time To Reflect"]

[Excerpts] The break created between Sunday's referendum and the official announcement of its results, to be

be made at the beginning of May, gives us a wonderful political breathing space in which to reflect. [passage omitted]

The president needs the people's will to be shown in a direct manner, as a mandate for continuing the reforms started 18 months ago which have met with harsh resistance within the Soviet power structures.

During the last six months the executive branch of power has been more taken up with justifications, explanations, and statements than with specific actions to transform the economy. It is not only opponents of the president's policies who are showing dissatisfaction with the reforms' progress but also their more radical supporters.

If this particular fact is understood and analyzed, the hope remains that Boris Yeltsin will not limit himself to important but nevertheless superficial measures affecting distribution, but will put forward a program to radicalize the reforms. I mean radicalization, not crude pressure and the "forcing through" of decisions already adopted.

Today it is already obvious that the decisions themselves are inadequate, that the government's potential has not been used, and that there is an absence of legislative proposals from the executive branch of power to deepen the economic reform. Those who insist on the president's taking harsh actions today based on the referendum results are also, clearly, not holding out any hope for new ideas. At the same time a peaceful, "amicable," but very clear decision would be preferable to society than another wave of tension, which would be unavoidable if there were a frontal attack.

Referendum Results Seen Inconclusive

MK2804104093 Moscow *SEGODNYA* in Russian No 11, 27 Apr 93 p 1 (signed to press 26 Apr)

[Sergey Parkhomenko article published in "Intransigents" column: "Referendum Results: New Weapons in Old Rivals' Hands"]

[Text] As expected, the preliminary results of the nationwide vote on 25 April prompt reflection not so much about a fundamental shift in the epic history of rivalry between the two ruling superclans in Russia's upper echelons—and certainly not about an end of this rivalry with the victory of one of the sides—as about a tougher struggle lying ahead. The referendum has not given a decisive advantage either to the presidential or to the parliamentary camp, but on the other hand it has substantially renewed and enriched the arsenal of arguments that in all likelihood will be used by them in mutual attacks and recriminations. The most likely tactics of the rivals in the new political campaign that began almost immediately after the polling stations had closed can be discerned quite clearly.

The parliamentary leaders, with the support of the conservative majority and the extreme national-patriotic

wing of the deputy corps, in offering their interpretations, evidently will be harping on the incontestable fact that on none of the four questions did the voting bring the referendum initiators a fundamental advantage. By rough estimates, slightly less than 60 percent of the voters who turned out expressed their support for the president. The number of ballots cast in approval of the socioeconomic policy pursued by the executive branch just barely passed the 50-percent mark—which, however, can by itself be regarded as a pleasant surprise for the ideologists of reform and generally as the greatest surprise of the referendum.

The correlation of this distribution of votes with the number of voters who took part in the plebiscite—which, according to the first, more or less full, reports from Russian Federation regions, is approximately 62 percent of the electorate—will undoubtedly prompt Boris Yeltsin's opponents to play up the fact that his power base is limited to just one-third of Russia's population. In the near future we are therefore to hear endless variations on the subject of the statement made by Ruslan Khasbulatov a day before the vote in an interview with *ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA*: "So what—will he on these grounds shatter our Constitution to pieces? Excuse me, but this trick just will not come to pass. Okay, we will see that one voter in three supports the president; all right, we will make note of that. And we will continue work as usual...."

As for the last two questions at the referendum, the decision on them, in line with the ruling of the Constitutional Court, may simply be considered as not made and therefore any attempts by the president to interpret the referendum results in his favor may be rejected.

Clearly, there will be no shortage of such attempts. The number of "yes" votes, indeed, fell far below the constitutional quota of 50 percent of the registered voters both on the question of early parliamentary elections and early presidential elections. But to be sure, the considerably higher, almost two-fold, number of positive answers to the fourth question, as compared with the third one, will be used far and wide in the upcoming statements by the presidential side.

But it is the results of the vote on confidence in Boris Yeltsin that provide the Kremlin team's most fertile ground for analysis. For instance, a comparison (along regional lines) of the number of voters who have confirmed this trust on 25 April with the corresponding number of Russian Federation citizens who cast their ballots for Yeltsin in the 1991 elections is in many cases fairly impressive. It is amazing that as a percentage of the turnout, the latest results are often considerably higher. Of course, the referendum and multi-candidate elections in theory are quite different events, but in the specific context of Russia this comparison does not appear so improper after all. Actually in 1991 the voters were also asked to choose mainly between Yeltsin and "no-Yeltsin." The real chances of, let us say, Bakatin or Ryzhkov were not very high from the start, and the

question was merely how many votes all five opponents en bloc could take away from the favorite....

The first conclusion that suggests itself here is that the mass opposition to Boris Yeltsin over the past two years has retreated to the sidelines of the political struggle, having to a large degree run out of steam. Two years ago the opponents of the democratic candidate considered it important to go the polling stations so as to vote against him, but this time they simply dodged the voting.

The second conclusion looks even more encouraging for the present Russian administration: Two years of exceptionally risky, objectively tough political and economic undertakings, characteristic of the reform concept being applied, have not alienated too many of the president's supporters. Yeltsin's losses do not exceed a few percentage points (literally percentage points!) of the republic electorate as a whole. This may mean, among other things, a conscious support that has come about as a result of much bitter experience by the fairly powerful strata of Russian society. And also the continuing—contrary to the opponents' self-assured predictions—trust, which by no means precludes the continuation of a tough political line.

Just how skillfully the intransigent rivals can dispose of these arguments provided to them by the referendum (as well as of many other ones) will become clear within the next few days. It is not ruled out that the Grand Kremlin Palace will become the place where the official results of the voting will be announced on 5 May. And this will happen minutes after the opening of yet another extraordinary congress.

Presidential Council Members View Referendum

PM2904112593 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 29 Apr 93 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Adoption of New Constitution Can No Longer Be Deferred"]

[Text] A session of the Presidential Council was held in the Kremlin yesterday. Opening it, Russian Federation Boris Yeltsin congratulated all those present on the referendum victory. He announced that there are three questions on the agenda: the political results of the referendum, the steps which must be taken at federal and regional levels, and the new Constitution. The editorial office asked members of the presidential council to voice their opinions on the questions discussed at yesterday's session.

Vladimir Tikhonov: It Is Not Branches of Power but Two Political Systems Which Are at Enmity

The preliminary results of the referendum make it possible to draw the following conclusion. First, the president and the policy of reforms he is pursuing won an unconditional victory. Second, there has been something

of a draw in assessing the actions of the deputies' corps with, it is true, a certain advantage going to the president's team.

But the main thing is not the results of the vote, but the conclusions drawn from it, which should determine a program of specific actions. As they say now, there is a new period ahead in the confrontation between the executive and legislative branches of power. In my view it is not two branches of power but two socioeconomic systems which are at enmity. One of them is leaving the political arena, the other is emerging. The president, who personifies the new system, must undertake a number of major socioeconomic reforms which would accelerate the birth of the future Russia. As for a topic close to me—agriculture—here the contradiction is revealed in the struggle between the collective and state farm system and the emerging new strata of landowners. So far the government has been obliged to make substantial concessions to the first force. And I fear these concessions will be the impetus to a new spiral of inflation.

Today many people are speaking of a crisis in the economy's agrarian sector. But surely a 9-10 percent fall in production this year is not a crisis? And the 150 million tonnes of grain harvested last fall, entirely adequate for the country's needs? Of course, a decline in production is a bad thing. But it is not a crisis, but socioeconomic instability, which is characterized by the struggle of the new against the old. Here "props" are needed for the new system. But not socioeconomic props but technical and organizational ones.

In my view we must immediately abolish the federal center for the management of the agrarian sector, which under Rutskoy's leadership has become a monopoly owner in the countryside, marginalizing the constitutional organ—the Ministry of Agriculture. That ministry should remain at the helm of the agrarian sector. But not as a monopolist but as a coordinator.

Dmitriy Volkogonov: The Supreme Soviet and the Congress Can Accept Only a Soviet Constitution. But We Have Already Had a Constitution Like That

I assess the results of the referendum as very positive. For me the most unexpected thing was voters' decision on the second question—approval of the socioeconomic policy course which the president is implementing.

That the president is supported by the majority of voters who went to vote I do not doubt. But as for the second question, I did not think there would be such support from voters. I believed that on the fourth question the majority would vote for re-elections of the deputies. But for me the most gratifying thing is how the army voted. The army gave the president considerably more support than the country as a whole. That means that the army personnel supported their supreme commander in chief.

And so great moral support was given at the referendum for the president, the course of reforms, and the need for a constitutional, civilized change to our society in all elements of power.

The most important unresolved question remains and also requires a civilized solution—the adoption of a new Constitution. I predict that this will be very complex. Neither the congress nor the Supreme Soviet can adopt the Constitution. Otherwise it will simply be a Soviet constitution, which does not need to be adopted. We have already had such a constitution. Therefore we must approach in a very serious and responsible manner the question of creating either a Constitutional Assembly or an all-Russian forum in which there will be proportional representation of republics, oblasts, and krais. The representatives of this forum will probably have to meet for a week or some specified time in order to resolve this essential question. The question of adopting a new Constitution is very complex, the most complex question of all, I fear, and I cannot give any formula, but its adoption can no longer be deferred.

We must also now raise the question of holding re-elections to parliament, at the same time abolishing the Congress. I am prepared for that and I know many deputies are prepared to issue a statement that the Congress should dissolve itself and hand over powers to a two-chamber parliament.

And one last point—the draft of the new Constitution. There is no doubt that it still contains some unevenness and amplification is needed but as a whole it is a very modern and democratic document which asserts a presidential republic.

A presidential republic accords with the spirit of our country and our Russian traditions. Presidential rule suits us more than a parliamentary republic.

Aleksey Yemelyanov: The People Have Proved To Be Above the Politicians

The results of the recent referendum instill hope. They create certain hopes for a positive long-term policy.

The main question of the referendum, as we know, was about confidence in the president. And strictly speaking the parliament and Congress pinned their hopes on this question. And here our people displayed their high degree of understanding of the thrust of what is happening. Just look: Some 58.5 percent of voters supported the president. And that under conditions when the implementation of the reform has caused considerable damage to the people's living standard. The confidence expressed in the president was the same as that voiced at the time of Yeltsin's election, back at the stage of our euphoria.

The second question was about the socioeconomic policy of the government and president. Let us not beat about the bush: The parliament, the parliament leadership, and the Congress gambled mainly on the referendum to

prepare a new basis for impeaching the president. That can be seen in all the questions of the referendum. The logic was as follows: If a positive assessment was given on the first question it would be necessary to emphasize the second question. That is people would put it like this: We trust the president but we do not approve of his policy. But something different happened, the people looked ahead. And they proved to be above many politicians. And the gamble of the parliament leadership, the deputies' corps, and its majority on this issue was beaten.

This positive voting on the first two questions creates a basis for subsequent calm, balanced work by the executive power.

What factors influenced these voting results? First, the people nonetheless look deeper than politicians. The people do not want a return to the past, but are voting for democratization and radical changes in living conditions.

Second, to some degree many people were voting not so much for Yeltsin as for the course itself, against those who advocate overthrowing the president. The people made their choice: Either the president president and his course or those who are struggling against the president. And who is struggling against the president? Parliament and all conservative forces which conspired around the parliament as never before. Look at the Congress and its sessions. You do not need to be a politician to see and understand who is leading you where. And the people felt that, they saw, and that is why they expressed themselves in this way. And they voted against those who want to overthrow the president.

And third, the Gorbachev effect was at work again. You recall how in the past Gorbachev constantly strove to prevent Yeltsin rising as a politician. And the more he strove to do that, the more the people advocated Yeltsin. Now the frenzied persecution of Yeltsin, organized by the uncivilized parliament and Congress, has worked in the president's favor. Everyone, both the supporters of executive power and the supporters of representational power, should draw conclusions from this.

Yeltsin Promises Called 'Rhetoric,' 'Waste of Time'

PM2804125393 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 28 Apr 93 First Edition p 1

[Aleksey Vorobyev commentary: "Voting Over. Time To Pick Up the Tab"]

[Text] Despite everything, a referendum is a good thing and it is good that it was held. Such measures serve the great cause of people's enlightenment better than any university. In just two or three weeks the country's citizens learn more about their rulers than they have ever learned even in years.

It was precisely the pre-referendum hunt for votes that revealed how many of the simplest cutlets the nation's favorite eats with potatoes after his righteous labors and where there is a nail sticking out of the chair of the nation's favorite. There were new sidelights on the nature of the popular comedian. The leader's boundless love for his people and his equally ardent desire to communicate with that people were unexpectedly revealed. Because apparently the president has no right to do anything without a good word about him from the people. Have we ever before been able to rejoice at such democracy?!

Incidentally, at long last the light of truth has been shed on this democracy. Until recently certain naive unsophisticated thought that democracy is when laws and rules in society are the same for everyone: both for "personages close to the emperor" and for the most ferocious dissidents. But during the campaign in support of the president elected by the whole people the "Democratic Russia" leaders dispelled that delusion, proving that their view of subtle matters like equality of rights is far more dialectical.

This dialectic is mixed up with the old principle: "If they are on our side, they are intelligence officers, if they are on theirs, they are spies." When the local authorities in some oblasts allocated "Democratic Russia" supporters a few minutes less TV airtime than their opponents, the angry voice of the aggrieved parties instantly reached Moscow and the "democratic" press immediately shouted: "Help!" It is unfair, they are infringing our rights! But when the vice president asked for live airtime to add to the people's knowledge about the morals of those in power, three TV companies swiftly turned down his request. And the "democratic" press supported this: There is no reason to spoil people's mood, they want to watch a thriller.

The people immediately remembered how annoyed Boris Nikolayevich was when, back in Communist Party times, the nomenklatura would not allow him to appear on TV and how much his present comrades in arms fulminated against the then "Ostankino" leadership for obediently carrying out any whim of the Politburo relics. They remembered and concluded: Either Boris Nikolayevich himself simply does not know about the discrimination against his deputy, because he would certainly punish the culprits, or there is some kind of higher state motive involved.

It soon transpired that there was indeed a motive! Because B. Yeltsin himself appeared on TV and, *inter alia*, stated that he and his team have a lot on their plate and let all sorts of people not get in the way of their work. In other words, democracy is democracy, but the president is the most equal among equal citizens.

The secret of the famous promise to put his head on the block and some other equally alluring ones has also been revealed recently. The perky Vladimir Shumeyko at long last explained to dim members of the public that these

had been ordinary rhetorical devices often used by politicians. For your information: The dictionary of foreign words defines rhetoric as the theory and art of eloquence, and also as highfalutin, fine, but meaningless talk. So, according to V. Shumeyko's explanations, the president's promises are rhetoric. Fine but meaningless. In the sense that they should not be trusted, and it is a total waste of time to wait for what is promised.

It would have been nice if the all-powerful vice premier had specified whether absolutely all the edicts and promises issued by Boris Nikolayevich in the last three weeks should be categorized as rhetorical, or just some of them? For instance, the promises made on TV to allocate land to officers discharged into the reserve and give them the right subsequently to sell it—is that an ordinary rhetorical device or a promissory note written in the heat of the moment and effectively introducing private ownership of land exclusively for officers?

But had the referendum not existed, we would have had to invent it! Thanks to it the Russian authorities remembered the poverty and underprivileged position of the military, students, pensioners, mothers with children, scientists, and miners. Each received an edict or promise, but the plebiscite is over, and the time to deliver on these promises is at hand. Or will they explain once again that all the promises were rhetoric?

If the president does not manage to make the switch from rhetoric to practice and does not bestow largesse on the aforementioned categories of citizens, we will all have a very depressing life, particularly Boris Nikolayevich. But if he manages to reapportion the meager state cake to benefit some at the expense of others, there will be rejoicing, because doctors, teachers, and peasants will start demanding a referendum. Everybody who missed out this time round. Then some other underprivileged group will appear—so let's have yet another referendum. For people must try at least somehow to transform into reality the democratic illusions that have been skillfully built up in them—illusions which are oddly close in their minds to belief in the czar as a kind father.

Then life will be one long referendum for us all.

Judge Disputes Constitutional Court Verdict

PM2804140393 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 28 Apr 93 First Edition p 2

[Aleksandr Linkov report on statement by V.O. Luchin, member of the Russian Federation Constitutional Court: "Congress Did Not Overstep Constitutional Framework"]

[Text] The Constitutional Court has delivered its verdict—that Part Two of Paragraph 2 of the Congress of People's Deputies decree on the procedure for summing up the referendum results with regard to the first two questions does not comply with the Russian Federation Constitution. The Constitutional Court decree has been

adopted, it is final and cannot be appealed. Nonetheless, there is no ban on expressing one's own opinion or sharing one's doubts. This is being done today by Viktor Osipovich Luchin, member of the Constitutional Court.

"Most of the judges were unanimous about questions three and four. They decided that the Congress of People's Deputies decree was legal, but I would like to dwell on questions one and two. They were formulated in such a way that their ambivalence [mnogoznachimost] was obvious, as was the vagueness of the legal consequences which would ensue after the result of the vote. Consequently, it was by no means easy for the court to reach a decision.

"First and foremost, the Law on the Referendum proposes a strict procedure only on questions of adopting changes and amendments to the Constitution. And attention needs to be drawn to the fact that the law talks not about changes or amendments, but on the questions of changes and amendments to the Constitution. There is a certain nuance to this. That is, it does not propose that a specific formula of an article or an individual statute in the fundamental law be submitted to a referendum. The way in which the Congress formulated the questions indeed left no certainty as regards their linkage to changes and amendments to the Constitution. And if there are doubts, questions arise as to why there should be a strict procedure. Are these maybe questions of ordinary political life or current legislation?

"I would like to stress that I condemn neither the position of the court as a whole nor that of my colleagues, I am simply trying to explain my own doubts. After all, the Congress and the deputies themselves should decide what nature and importance the first question on the referendum has. After all, they made the choice with their own votes to the effect that these are questions of altering and amending the Constitution. It is quite possible that not all of them had perceived the need to include them in the text of the fundamental law.

"I have come to the conclusion that the Constitution changes even when no changes and amendments are made to it. How? The element of confidence or no-confidence is an entirely new aspect of the president's constitutional status. After all, his legal position is a constitutional position. His rights, obligations, and responsibilities are defined by the fundamental law. It makes no mention of confidence or no-confidence. Yet this is an element of legal status. And when the question of introducing such an element is being decided—even with regard to the current president rather than the presidency as a whole, and particularly with regard to Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin—then he enjoys the said [dannyy] legal status. If the element of confidence or no-confidence is introduced, the constitutional status is altered. This means that the Constitution is altered too. Not necessarily textually, we would emphasize, but by means of the one-shot establishment of this element for President B. Yeltsin.

"No, there would seem to be no direct link between the formula 'Do you have confidence in the president or not' and a subsequent amendment to the Constitution, but the fundamental law envisages not only the president's dismissal [otresheniye] but also his resignation [otstavka]. Admittedly, without defining or interpreting this institution. Consequently, resignation might also be proposed as a forcible sanction for certain actions.

"I do not see it as being mandatory that in the event of a vote of no-confidence lawmakers would make changes indicating that an expression of no-confidence in the course of a referendum is grounds for resignation. But the fact that this is an element of constitutional status is, for me, obvious. I am proceeding from the premise that the Congress also followed this logic in laying down that votes would be calculated on the basis of the number of people entitled to take part in the vote.

"I have attentively reread the Law on the Referendum several times. And I have concluded that the Congress was not changing it. It lays down two procedures for calculating votes. Who decides this issue? Does the Constitution state that determining the nature of questions submitted for a referendum falls under the purview of the Supreme Soviet, the president, or the Constitutional Court? No. Article 104 directly states that referenda are called by the Congress of People's Deputies. They fall exclusively within its purview. Therefore the question can be asked: Why does the Constitutional Court have more rights than the Congress when it comes to determining the legal fate of the questions submitted? I believe that this falls under the Congress' jurisdiction. And it does not overstep the framework of the Constitution or of the Law on the Referendum. I admit that this might be wrong in social and political terms. But not in terms of any violation of the fundamental law. The Congress selected one of the procedures envisaged by the Law on the Referendum—Article 35, but the one in Part Four rather than Part Three.

"It is often alleged that the Congress has broken the law, but laws are adopted by the Supreme Soviet. And the Constitution lays down a definite co-subordination—Supreme Soviet acts should not contravene laws and other acts passed by the Congress of People's Deputies. These include decrees. Since the Constitution lays down this relationship, it is impossible to disregard it. Thus in this respect too I see no incorrectness or unconstitutionality about the Congress decree."

Supreme Soviet

Further on 28 Apr Supreme Soviet Session

Rutskoy Invited To Detail Charges

LD2804074393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English
0730 GMT 28 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Ivan Novikov]

[Text] Moscow April 28 TASS—The Russian parliament invited Vice-President Aleksandr Rutskoy to expand on corruption charges against high-ranking officials during parliamentary hearings on the creation of a special commission of prosecutors who will investigate the accusations of top-level corruption advanced by Rutskoy before the referendum.

The issue was included in today's agenda of the parliamentary session and the main report is to be delivered by Prosecutor General Valentin Stepankov.

Rutskoy Addresses Session

LD2804232293 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1940 GMT 28 Apr 93

[Address by Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy to the Supreme Soviet; on 28 April; from the "Russian Supreme Soviet" program—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed people's deputies: you are well aware that since 16 April I have given you details of incidents of corruption, abuse of authority, and malpractice in the economic sphere; the mass media has published many reports denying the facts cited by me here, at the Supreme Soviet. But you will probably recollect that when I cited those facts, I made references to specific documents that all have incoming and outgoing numbers, that have all been signed by particular officials and bear a stamp of some department or other. Therefore, the information I supplied to you then was meant to familiarize you with facts—you will recall that I simply acquainted the people's deputies of the Russian Federation with the facts occurring in the activities of all echelons of power.

I would like to reiterate that I can show a document confirming each fact I have mentioned. In fact, this is what I was going to do when I asked for air time. In what sense? Well, because even the few newspaper cuttings I have—here they are, I simply cut them out of papers—and here is an interesting point: one of the authors maintains that red mercury does not exist and another one says that it does exist and that I have committed high treason—Sadykov, for one, says this—by showing an agreement with an American company for supplies of 84 tonnes of red mercury to the value of \$24.2 billion. You see my point? The matter needs some looking into, it does need some looking into.

As for violations of law in privatization, here also lots of facts can be given, and I have not been thinking things up in this case either, because those documents were also available—for example, where the Russian Federation transport network was involved, the documents of the Transport Ministry were supplied, recording an application to the inter-departmental commission and a request to consider this or that aspect of privatization.

There is, for example, the following figure: the Procuracy has already instituted proceedings in 7,000 instances of violation of the law on privatization—7,000 instances!

They are all recorded ones. But how many unrecorded instances there must be! There will not be enough space here if one just lists and quotes these examples. That is why I requested, accordingly, that air time should be made available, and especially since it was made available to those people, and it was made directly available to Sadykov. Air time was made available to Anatoliy Borisovich Chubays, deputy chairman of the government. Air time was made available to generals from the Western Group of Forces. It was simply stated openly that Rutskoy, the vice president, chairman of the Inter-departmental Commission, actually committed forgery, lied and so on and so forth.

I think you understand the reason why these people were given air time. You understand. But if you look back at all these articles in the newspapers IZVESTIYA and ROSSIYSKIYE VEDOMOSTI—always the same papers, for some reason, print denials—it is this that is nothing but lies, since, for each instance of information, I can supply an example.

Furthermore, during that period, instances were forwarded to the Procuracy, and the Procuracy instituted proceedings in nine cases that the Interdepartmental Commission had forwarded to the Procuracy and the investigative bodies. But I want to draw your attention to the fact that the Security Ministry and the Interior Ministry have not got a single document, and even my requests for documents were not forwarded to them by the Interdepartmental Commission. So the collection of this information is being carried out by the working apparatus—on social principles, in theory.

But I will tell you that today, for example, very interesting documents were brought in on Sverdlovsk Oblast. In one year, strategic resources and, especially, rare earth, metals which have a fantastic value—the value is fixed literally in grams—provisionally valued at over \$3.5 billion, were exported. That is just one oblast. Do you remember that figure of 17 billion that I quoted? If one oblast accounts for 3.5 billion, then what were the other oblasts doing? Incidentally, these things did not pass, in the main, through the Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations.

All these operations were conducted in line with a protocol signed by Gennadiy Eduardovich [Burbulis]. I am not saying that Gennadiy Eduardovich is a criminal or has committed a crime, but it is plainly evident here that he exceeded his official powers. Therefore, again we will finish formulating this case and duly systematizing it and will then hand it over to the procurator.

As for the reason that I have been invited here, it concerns the Supreme Soviet resolution that you are considering today. I earnestly ask you to support General Procurator Valentin Georgiyevich [Stepankov] and to agree to his proposal concerning the creation of a special commission. Nevertheless, I think that no one has any doubts about the general procurator's professionalism and that the people that will be engaged on these matters

will be selected by the general procurator and that the general procurator is responsible. Therefore, there is a need to set up this special commission under the general procurator's office. It is obviously needed, because the amount of facts and information on matters of corruption, economic law infringements, and on matters of officials exceeding their authority is increasing with every passing day. The working apparatus at the general procurator's office is insufficient.

I agreed therefore to take part in the work of a special commission of the working apparatus, the interdepartmental commission, which has been systematizing the materials that have been handed over to the procuracy. Therefore, I have one earnest request, that you support the general procurator and adopt this resolution, the more so since this special commission is accountable to the Supreme Soviet, and it will accordingly inform you at a specified time to be stipulated by you. I think that it will be in the month of June when you will receive a fairly voluminous amount of information about those matters that I have been citing. Of course, if there is any additional material, it can be presented to the interdepartmental commission, and I would remind you that the interdepartmental commission includes three chairmen of Supreme Soviet committees, the first deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet, the general procurator, the top judge, the vice president, the minister of security, and the minister of internal affairs. There is a corresponding working apparatus.

So, if you have any materials, please hand them over. Virtually every day two or three sets of materials are brought in to the interdepartmental commission and people are studying these questions. Therefore, I once again ask you, I earnestly ask you, to support the proposal of the procurator general and to set up a commission that would begin work without delay because, once again, there are very many cases where people are beginning to destroy documents and even from these considerations—I am not going to read out now the various documents, if only because in the interests of the investigation and conducting the investigation on these questions—I think that there is no sense in reading out these documents. But if any individual people's deputy has any doubts, I can acquaint him with the relevant documents. He can come to me and he can see that what I am saying here is no lie, but facts backed up with documentation. Thank you for your attention.

Privatization Program 'Unsatisfactory'

LD2804100393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0935
GMT 28 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Yuriy Filippov]

[Text] Moscow April 28 TASS—The Russian Supreme Soviet has described the work of the State Property

Managing Committee, headed by Deputy Prime Minister Anatoliy Chubays, as unsatisfactory with regard to the 1992 programme to privatise state and municipal enterprises.

The parliament adopted a resolution today in which it entrusts its budget control committee to audit the activities of Chubays' committee.

During discussion of amendments to the draft resolution, Parliament Speaker Ruslan Khasbulatov proposed scrapping the Supreme Soviet committee for economic reforms and property, headed by people's deputy Sergey Krasavchenko.

As a result of voting a decision was passed to reorganise this committee into a permanent commission of the chamber of the republic on property and privatisation questions.

According to the resolution, the Russian Government must submit a draft privatisation programme to parliament no later than May 30, 1993.

Security Force for Parliament Approved

LD2804113293 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1118
GMT 28 Apr 93

[Text] Moscow April 28 TASS—The Russian Parliament turned down a request of Boris Yeltsin to refrain from instituting its own security service. The president had earlier returned a corresponding law back to parliament saying that it violates the constitution and acting legislation.

On Wednesday [28 April] legislators adopted the law "On State Protection of Supreme Legislative Bodies of State Power of the Russian Federation" which creates a security department at the parliament.

The new federal agency will protect the parliament speaker, the Congress of People's Deputies, the parliament and the CIS Interparliamentary Assembly.

Customs Code Adopted

LD2804154293 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1341
GMT 28 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Yuriy Filippov]

[Text] Moscow April 28 TASS—The Russian Parliament adopted the Customs Code of the Russian Federation today. The document, containing over 450 articles, defines legal, economic and organizational principles of the customs service and is aimed at defending economic sovereignty and economic security of Russia.

The protection of the Russian market, the development of the economy, the assistance to the implementation of structural policy in the economy, the encouragement of the competition, the counteraction to monopolization and the attraction of foreign investments are among the

main objects of the Russian Federation's customs policy which have been specially noted in the code.

Yugoslav Conflict Discussed

LD2804213393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English
2030 GMT 28 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Sergey Nikishov]

[Text] Moscow April 29 TASS—The Russian Parliament has resumed the discussion of the situation in former Yugoslavia at its evening session on Wednesday [28 April].

In the morning, when Deputy Oleg Rummyantsev suggested holding another debate on this problem, Russian Parliamentary Speaker Ruslan Khasbulatov did not rule out that some agreements on the Yugoslav problem had been reached during the U.S.-Russian summit in Vancouver.

Two draft resolutions of the Russian Parliament concerning possible military interference in the Yugoslav conflict were submitted to the parliament. Presenting a draft resolution on the problem prepared by the Parliamentary Committee for International Affairs and Foreign Economic Relations, its chairman, Yevgeniy Ambartsumov, said that "military interference and sanctions against Yugoslavia were "counter-productive." In his opinion, they will lead "not to the reconciliation and settlement, but to the continuation of the conflict and, possibly, to a new European war."

Deputy Russian Foreign Minister Vitaliy Churkin said that "Russia should not be at odds with the rest of the world over the problem of where the border between Bosnia and Herzegovina should be." Churkin denied statements alleging that the Russian Foreign Ministry is looking to the West as regards the Yugoslav problem. He said that the positions of the world community on the Yugoslav problem are very close. Churkin warned deputies against making harsh statements on the Yugoslav problem.

A number of deputies strongly criticised the positions of the Russian Foreign Ministry. Deputy Vitaliy Sevastyanov described this position as "treacherous." In his opinion, Gensher's plan on splitting the country is being realised in Yugoslavia. Sevastyanov believes that the United States is interested in the conflict and that "the U.S. will make every effort to enter Yugoslavia." Sevastyanov called to use the right to veto any U.N. resolution on military interference in Yugoslavia.

Oleg Rummyantsev, the author of the other draft resolution on Yugoslavia, drew attention to the geopolitical character of the Yugoslav conflict which poses a threat of a third Balkan war.

"The question of support to new Yugoslavia is a question of the future of the Russian Federation," Rummyantsev said.

The debates on the problem will be continued on Thursday.

Deputies Condemn Stance on Yugoslavia

LD2804230693 Moscow Russian Television Network
in Russian 1940 GMT 28 Apr 93

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] At the end of today's session of the Supreme Soviet, the situation in Yugoslavia and the Russian Government's policy with regard to this matter was discussed. Many deputies condemned the actions of Russia's Foreign Ministry and the government's stand in no uncertain terms.

[Begin recording] [Deputy Vitaliy Sevastyanov] [words indistinct] Esteemed people's deputies, the issue we are discussing today is an extremely important one. This might happen to be the main issue of the next two or three years in history. I would only like to say one thing—perhaps I am saying this to be heard by our Ministry of Foreign Affairs more than for anything else, and especially by Mr. Deputy Minister: What is now happening in Yugoslavia is Genscher's plan, and Genscher, who had a definite aim of splitting Yugoslavia, proposed this plan to the EC which supported all this, and so Croatia and Slovenia became separated from Yugoslavia.

[Deputy Oleg Rummyantsev] Esteemed members of the Supreme Soviet. It seems to me to be really vital, and this was mentioned several times today, that we should not miss again such an important geopolitical problem, as we have done so often in the past because if we had confined ourselves to just listening to the facts yesterday, we would not have made any progress and then we would have been wringing our hands after the adoption of the resolutions making it possible to deliver bomb strikes on the Serbian positions in Bosnia—resolutions which might bring about really appalling consequences. The chief tragedy about today's discussion which is taking place here and which, of course, is also taking place outside parliament is that the stand of Serbia, of Serbs in Bosnia is being mainly defended by the [Russian] opposition. Many of the democrats, sadly, express their agreement with the stand of President Yeltsin and Minister Kozyrev—which was called, for instance, a policy of westernization in a tv program yesterday by Boris Notkin, a publicist and tv journalist whom I respect very much—a policy of reform and of westernization. And there is a great danger that amid all this westernization with a democratic tendency we could forget our national interests, state interests, and national pride.

[Deputy V.I. Morokin] ...and today, after it has been proved and it is known to all intelligence services in all countries—including ours—now a full blockade is being imposed on Serbia and Montenegro and there are threats of bomb strikes over and over again! [incomplete sentence as heard] And our representative of the Foreign Ministry here gives us answers to the effect that, well, you know, it is unclear what the Security Council will decide. That is, we wake up tomorrow morning and discover that 150,000 Serbs have been destroyed in the

same way in which 150,000 peaceful residents of Iraq were destroyed under the aegis of a United Nations mandate. And they are telling us: Don't frighten people by calling this international terrorism. But, Mr. Churkin, do you really imagine anyone will even look at these international rules if this happens? Just remember Leskov's story, "The Enchanted Pilgrim", just think of our Russian literature. If you vote for bombing Serbia, tomorrow committees of solidarity with Serbia will spring up all over the country! [end recording]

Krasavchenko Comments on Privatization

LD2804132893 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 0830 GMT 28 Apr 93

[Interview with Sergey Nikolayevich Krasavchenko, chairman of the Committee on Economic Reform and Property, by commentator Aleksandr Ruvinskiy, at the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet—live]

[Text] [Ruvinskiy] I believe that one of the points in today's Supreme Soviet resolution calls for the reorganization of this...

[Krasavchenko, interrupting] ... our committee.

[Ruvinskiy] ... committee. We all thought the Supreme Soviet would begin with the reorganization of the Committee on the Mass Media. That was due to happen today or tomorrow. But the sequence of events was quite unexpectedly changed. Please would you comment on what has happened for the benefit of our listeners?

[Krasavchenko] In the first place, I agree with [Deputy Prime Minister] Chubays that the deputies really have lost touch with the electorate. They now seem to have forgotten about the decisions on economic reform and property which our committee recommended to the Supreme Soviet and Congress, which our other deputies repeatedly explained to the Congress and the Supreme Soviet leadership. They have forgotten about the laws and resolutions on which the economic reform was based.

This sudden decision, stemming from the problems which, the deputies feel, have arisen during the implementation of the state program for 1992, perhaps comes as a surprise for listeners, for voters, for logical people who link the committee's work with the economic reform, rather than with the views of its chairman on other issues, or the behavior of committee members who do not always vote in accordance with the wishes of the Supreme Soviet leadership—who almost always vote differently in fact.

[Ruvinskiy] Is this an attempt to completely frustrate the economic reforms, in spite of the results of the referendum held only three days ago?

[Krasavchenko] Of course. They want the preparation of legislation to be in the hands of different people. Proposals were already being made today for amendments

to the privatization law, giving priority to work collectives. There were calls for a return to the old laws and regulations. This is an obvious attempt to restore the past, by the tried and tested method of personnel changes.

But this personnel problem is once again being tackled in the traditional way, by quickly bringing up a question which has not got much to do with the subject under discussion. They want to reorganize the committee, perhaps in order to end the key role of a number of People's Deputies who were handling questions of economic reform. By making personnel changes they want to bring in a different policy. Otherwise there is no explanation for this.

[Ruvinskiy] I would like to explain to our listeners that the report on this resolution was delivered today by Veniamin Sokolov, chairman of the Soviet of the Republic. Right at the start of his speech, he stressed that, in his view, the economic policies have not been endorsed by a majority of Russia's population—in spite of the crystal-clear referendum results which everybody knows about.

[Krasavchenko] Yes. People's Deputy Veniamin Sokolov holds different views. We know what they are. From the first congress onwards we have got to know him as one of the organizers and coordinators of the Communists of Russia faction. He does not deny that he has not renounced his communist ideals.

[Ruvinskiy] He was supported by Ruslan Khasbulatov.

[Krasavchenko] Yes, by Ruslan Imranovich. Deputies who happen to be lawyers say there were a whole series of procedural violations in this decision on the reorganization of our committee which was adopted in such haste today. It cannot be reorganized just like that. A separate resolution abolishing the committee has to be adopted first. Then the Soviet of the Republic has to pass a resolution setting up the commission. The draft resolution proposed that the Presidium should be asked to do this instead.

We have gotten used to the idea of content analysis and seeking out key phrases. At the meeting of the Supreme Soviet Presidium, Ruslan Imranovich said that if there had been another three days, there would have been a breakthrough in influencing the Russian public's views on the crucial referendum issues. Today he also repeated that there is no time to spare. So, deputies are being hurried. They are passing decisions in haste. I think the decision taken on our committee will not help the Supreme Soviet in its activities, let alone the economic reforms which were endorsed by our voters.

[Ruvinskiy] Maybe it will be the subject of an appeal to the Constitutional Court, since procedures for the adoption of such decisions were violated. After all, there is a law on the activities of the Supreme Soviet and its committees. No doubt amendments to the law should be tabled in the proper way.

[Krasavchenko] Of course. Furthermore, everybody knows that a resolution on ways of improving the work of the Supreme Soviet has already been drafted. I would not object at all if our committee were reorganized. There have already been proposals on this. These would help make it more effective, either within the framework of a single chamber or within the framework of a committee. But this has to be decided in an integrated way, in consultation with other committees and commissions.

The way it was done today is obviously not in the interests of reform. The wholly political interests of people who are trying to resolve political issues by the old methods have prevailed over the interests of the legislative process. Not for nothing was it suggested that some committees should be abolished and others amalgamated. Sergey Kovalev joked yesterday that Ruslan Khasbulatov should consider merging all the committees in a single Central Committee, with a general secretary at its head. Then everything would be all right.

[Ruvinskiy] Thank you, Sergey Nikolayevich Krasavchenko.

Kozyrev 27 Apr Address on Tajikistan

LD2804145693 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1948 GMT 27 Apr 93

[Address by Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev to the Supreme Soviet in Moscow on 27 April; for the "From the Russian Supreme Soviet Session Program"—recorded]

[Text] Various political forces in Tajikistan, representing different governments both in the past and at present, as well as the Supreme Soviet—that is, all the bodies of power of various political orientations at different times—have been looking toward Russia. I would like to stress they have been looking toward Russia—appealing to it to help stabilize the situation and send in a peace-keeping contingent.

It is obvious to me that Tajikistan, as a republic of the former USSR, is linked to us by thousands of threads. These include a more than 200,000-strong Russian speaking population, without mentioning the fraternal ties between Russians and Tajiks, between the Russian and the Tajik nations. It must be seen as a zone of special responsibility and special interest to the Russian Federation, in particular, because this republic is a member of the CIS.

I would like to go straight to minor differences between projects submitted by the committee of the Supreme Soviet and by the president. They can be boiled down to attempts to establish a specific plan, although not a strict one. It seems to me that either one could be adopted. However, I do see certain qualities in the presidential draft, simply because it depends directly on us. This is

our responsibility, although Tajikistan does appeal to the CIS. However, it appeals to us first of all—to Russia, to Moscow, if you will.

Sergey Vadimovich Stepashin has been there, and so have I—twice in the last few months. My last trip took place very recently. Basically, our military men, our Russian servicemen on site, are expecting this from us. As for other CIS states, a decision to send their forces has, in fact, been adopted in principle. It was adopted at the January session of the CIS heads of state summit. However, it is quite difficult to translate it into the language of the agreements mentioned here, because of local approval procedures in the Supreme Soviets.

There are a number of other reasons. I must say that this matter has been included in the agenda of tomorrow's meeting of the CIS heads of government. Viktor Stepanovich Chernomyrdin will once more raise the question of implementing this decision, which has been agreed on principle by the heads of state.

Media Committee's Activities Criticized

LD2704200093 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1700 GMT 27 Apr 93

[Text] Vyacheslav Bragin, chairman of the Russian Ostankino State Television and Radio Company, has described what is now happening in the Supreme Soviet Committee for the Media as a continuation of the policy of disregarding and suppressing the committee's democratic activities, and as an attempt to pressurize the committee in a new round of political confrontation following the referendum.

The former chairman of that parliamentary committee gave an interview to an ITAR-TASS correspondent after a press conference held by committee members in connection with the statement by Vladimir Lisin, the present leader, on the need to reorganize the committee. The forces that thought that they would win the referendum and that the president would be defeated are now trying to salvage their reputations, Vyacheslav Bragin noted. They want to explain Yeltsin's victory not by a natural expression of the people's will, but by the actions of the mass media.

Chubays Deplores Parliament Decision on Privatization

LD2804130193 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 0830 GMT 28 Apr 93

[Text] Commentator Aleksandr Ruvinskiy, who is at the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, is on the line. We are listening to you, Aleksandr Ilyich.

[Ruvinskiy] This is an unscheduled report from the White House. We expected to report on events here for the afternoon Panorama sequence, but fairly important events have taken place here. Decisions have been made about which I have to inform our listeners.

Let me remind you that the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet has today been considering a resolution on implementing the state program for the privatization of state and municipal enterprises during 1992. This resolution had been put off for quite a long time, but today—now that the referendum is over, I stress—the deputies have returned to the issue.

The decisions they made were a great surprise to many. Immediately after the session, I spoke to Deputy Prime Minister Anatoliy Borisovich Chubays. Listen to my short interview with him.

[Begin recording] [Ruvinskiy] Anatoliy Borisovich, what do you think of what happened at the Supreme Soviet today?

[Chubays] Very briefly, this can only be regarded as a sign that the people's deputies are now completely out of touch with the people who elected them. Judge for yourself—the key point in the decision which they made is the judgement that the results of privatization during 1992 are unsatisfactory. The deputies found it possible to make this decision just three days after the Russian people had answered unequivocally yes to the second question in the referendum, thereby expressing support for the socioeconomic policies pursued in Russia last year.

Surely, everyone can see that one of the main components in this policy was the policy of privatization. It has now been finally established that legally and politically the people's deputies represent only themselves, that the Supreme Soviet represents only itself. Its positions, its views, and its assessments are now completely out of touch with the views and assessments the Russian people expressed at the referendum.

That does not mean that we believe our privatization is all perfect and wonderful. We are indeed aware of blunders and mistakes, and we are trying to put them right. All the same, the main thing has now been said. The Supreme Soviet's view and assessment of events completely contradicts those expressed by the Russian people during the referendum.

[Ruvinskiy] Thank you. [end recording]

Sokolov Blames Gaydar for Economic Collapse

PM2704131593 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Apr 93 pp 1, 2

[Interview with Veniamin Sergeyevich Sokolov, newly elected chairman of the Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Republic, by Aleksandr Shinkin; place and date not given: "It Is Not A Firm Hand but A Sober Head That Russian Needs"—first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] Veniamin Sergeyevich Sokolov was recently elected chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Republic. Although now a politician, he remains an academic. A worthy figure in the world of science, an

academician of the RAO [expansion unknown], he does not like labels and tries to approach the evaluation of events from a position of "specific analysis of a specific situation."

[Shinkin] Veniamin Sergeyevich, what is the choice facing Russia today, in your view?

[Sokolov] The alternative now is not to move forward with Yeltsin or back into the past with the patriots and communists. There is not a single sensible person today, never mind a politician, who talks about bringing back the old ways. In principle this is neither possible nor serious. The alternative lies in the kind of reforms being carried out by Yeltsin's team. You see, the policy which they began in late 1991 is leading to the disappearance of Russia as an autonomous, strong, and independent state. And hence the question today is as follows: either we continue this policy, or we preserve the state, create a mixed market economy in the interests of our own people, and really revive Russia.

[Shinkin] Would it really be fair, Veniamin Sergeyevich, to lay the blame for the country's ruination solely on Boris Yeltsin?

[Sokolov] You cannot understand the present without understanding the past. Let us go back to 1985. A group of Western academics prepares a report for UNESCO. Its topic is the quality of life in the countries of the world. On the basis of scientifically corroborated and easily measurable data, they break them up into 12 groups. The USSR finds itself in the second group. That is to say, among the top 25 countries of the world. However much we sit in sackcloth and ashes, we had a science of world standard and many sectors were working on world-leading technologies.

It was from this position that the task should have been set: to modify the economy that had been floundering for many years in such a way as to bring the country in the shortest possible time into the top group of the world's countries. In my view, this required decentralization of the forms of ownership and the systems of administration and sociopolitical life. However, it is my profound conviction that the country's leadership in 1985 simply did not understand, right to the end, just what their inheritance was and what they had to do with it. They started, as it were, to act like a layabout who unexpectedly receives a big inheritance.

The tragedy was also facilitated by the fact that the leaders of the CPSU, while preaching scientific approaches, in actual fact had long since "gone off the rails" and were in reality engaging in unscientific phrasemongering. However, this is a sort of law of nature. After all, the selection of cadres for the party administration proceeded according to fairly closed principles. And, as we know, any closed system degenerates. That is the second law of thermodynamics. As a result, instead of

the country resolving the contradictions which had accumulated through natural methods, exploiting its enormous potential, it began to collapse. This is how I would evaluate in broad terms what happened on the eve of Yeltsin's reform.

[Shinkin] And what is happening at the present moment?

[Sokolov] So as not to speak without adducing proof, I will cite the words of that ideologue of the reform, Boris Yeltsin's adviser Gavriil Popov. On 21 April he published an article in MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI in which he said that Gaydar's economic policy could have ended in Russia's transformation into a raw materials adjunct of the developed Western countries—and still may do so. I will cite the key elements of the article: Yeltsin chose a model of macroeconomic regulation—the IMF's model, Gaydar's model. The essence of it is that Russia turns into a raw materials country which lives and develops as the IMF tells it. Only people who either did not know Russia, Popov writes, or who had lost hope in the future after the collapse of the CPSU could have contemplated this model.

And here is another interesting feature. This time political. Popov noted that the Gaydar model requires a strong authoritarian power which, on the one hand, would support the budding class of capitalists and, on the other, could crush the opposition of its own people.

It is here, of course, that the key to understanding the present political situation lies. In my opinion, the goals and means of achieving them could not be more clearly set forth. But how are we to understand the words of the president himself when he says that Russia's internal affairs fall within the range of U.S. interests? Naturally, that is the reason for this pressure on the people's deputies—on the Supreme Soviet and the Congress, which have started to interfere with the implementation of a policy aimed at destroying Russia.

[Shinkin] Excuse me, Veniamin Sergeyevich, but everything that Popov and Yeltsin have said could be put down to political rhetoric, as Vice Premier Shumeyko likes to say.

[Sokolov] But what rhetoric we have here! Look, instead of exploiting the scientific and technical potential of the military-industrial complex to renew Russia's entire industry, the military-industrial complex is simply being destroyed. And the two or three plants in the sector which have been successfully switched to the production of peaceful output are held up as successes of the structural overhaul. Our aircraft construction, for all its inadequacies, did not yield to foreign competitors. It supplied up to 40 percent of the world's aviation stock. Today the sector is on the verge of bankruptcy. And it could have brought in colossal income.

The picture is the same across the board. Arguments that the West will help to raise our economy are a bluff. They have crushed us as a military competitor, and they will crush us as an industrial competitor. Within two years

our economy has half collapsed. The downturn in production has reached around 40 percent. Moreover, note, the output of basic consumer goods and products has been halved. And this in turn raises their cost and cranks up the inflation mechanism.

[Shinkin] Veniamin Sergeyevich, you are probably not listening to the president's entourage. They all say with one voice that it is the Central Bank's policy that is responsible for our unbridled inflation—its huge preferential credits, and the budget deficit which the government is being prevented from tackling.

[Sokolov] On the contrary, I listen to them very attentively. And I am surprised how well they have learned to use propaganda tricks on Staraya Ploshad to divert people from the crucial issues. While we are on the subject of inflation, let me mention the following detail. In the opinion of specialists, in the total of inflationary sources the budget deficit constitutes roughly 15-17 percent and bank credits somewhere around 10 percent. On the other hand, foreign economic activity accounts for 65-70 percent. It is the main drive belt of inflation.

I will not touch on the policy of direct barter and technical credits which are in effect gifts to the CIS countries. Thanks to this some of them have become leading exporters of Russian raw materials and are supplementing their coffers nicely. But foreign economic policy with respect to other countries does deserve attention. Boris Yeltsin's edict in January last year on liberalization in this sphere led to \$17-20 billion settling in accounts in Western states last year. This, let me remark, is according to specialists' estimates. The Supreme Soviet's attempts to receive specific details from the government have hitherto not met with success.

[Shinkin] Does that mean you to some degree corroborate the words of Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy about corruption in the sphere of foreign economic activity?

[Sokolov] Forgive me, it is an investigator's job to corroborate incidents of abuse by state officials. All I am saying is that, despite the Supreme Soviet's attempts to investigate how we trade, what we trade in, and what profit comes from our trade, the government is ducking the question and is unwilling to introduce basic order. That means that such a policy on the part of the government is highly suitable for someone or other. Unfortunately, what goes on in foreign economic activity also suits a certain section of parliamentarians. So everything carries on just as before.

[Shinkin] That last sigh of yours was reminiscent of the president's complaints about being hampered by the Constitution. Do you share his sorrow?

[Sokolov] Not at all. The basic amendments to the Constitution were made at the time when Boris Nikolayevich was chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet. And, let me remark, he swore allegiance to a Constitution, the amendments to which he signed himself. Then

he becomes head of the Constitutional Commission which, according to law, can amend the Constitution. Again nothing was passed without the president's approval. In addition, not one law passed by the Supreme Soviet comes into force without the president's signature. So that all complaints about infringement of his rights are pure speculation.

The fact that, at the Fifth Congress of People's Deputies, under the influence of Yeltsin's fiery speech about the need for reforms deputies gave him extraordinary powers is quite another matter. They gave them on the strength of slogans. And when they realized to what a pass these presidential powers had brought the country, deputies decided at the Seventh Congress to return to the order which was established formerly by Yeltsin himself. And he did not like that.

[Shinkin] But do you think that Boris Yeltsin is ready to become leader of a democratic Reich?

[Sokolov] Judging by his statement that there is no alternative to him, yes I do. But let us look at it soberly: Yeltsin has no personal power. In fact certain persons exercise power through him. Despite his outward decisiveness, it is my conviction that the man is by no means strong but extremely weak-willed. You can observe this in a dozen ways. So that his image as created by the biased mass media is far from the truth.

[Shinkin] Nevertheless, Veniamin Sergeyevich, talk of a "firm hand" capable of imposing order and getting the country out of crisis is not without sense, you will agree?

[Sokolov] Rubbish. We do not need a firm hand but a sober head, which can grasp what is really going on in Russia and what we are losing in the course of reforms. I have already said: Today you cannot make people march in formation like before. The mentality is different. People are ready to work in market conditions, but there is no opportunity for them to do so. After all, only trade capital is flourishing today. No amount of tinned stew from Holland will save us. And our grandchildren will have to pay even for that. No one gives anything for nothing.

There are, after all, national, state interests. There are state economic regulators. We have to completely change the Gaydar course. The stabilization of the economy lies not only in the financial sphere, but above all in the productive, normal work of enterprises. Modifications of the course and attempts to imbue it with elements of social protection of the population are a myth. The government simply does not have such an ability. All that you can get out of an empty pocket is what we call zilch.

[Shinkin] Will the referendum alter the present situation? What will it give to politicians and to the people?

[Sokolov] To be honest, in our present economic situation no elections or referendum are worth holding. I have great doubt as to whether the people will turn out. After

all, judging by experience of elections of people's deputies to vacant seats, 30-35 percent of voters turn out to vote. Apart from North Ossetia, there is nowhere which has had more elections.

But if the "fourth estate" does manage to persuade the people to turn out for the referendum, its results will produce nothing except a new spiral of political blather and confrontation.

[Shinkin] But the president has stated that, if he does not get the people's support, he will resign.

[Sokolov] What does it mean: Will he get support or not? Let us suppose that 25 percent of those who participate in the elections express confidence in him. That is the constitutional norm for electing someone president. Don't forget whom the laws were written for, and how. What follows from this? Do the people trust their president or not? According to the law, it would seem, yes, they do. But the majority of the population—75 percent—have said "no," or, finally exhausted by phrasemongering, they have washed their hands of the whole thing. What is this: the support of the people? So that the outcome of this event is obscure. And those who engineered it evidently calculated this well.

Then what about the question of confidence in the president? It says nothing and commits him to nothing. I would understand if the question had been about confirming the president's powers. De Gaulle acted the same way in his time. Then everything is clear. The people either confirm these powers for Boris Yeltsin, or they do not. Then there is no ambiguity.

But the presidential side prefers in general to act regardless of obstacles, guided by the principle that the end justifies the means. According to Yeltsin, the Constitution is bad. Can you imagine the current U.S. President Clinton suddenly announcing that he will not obey the Constitution, in which there are three short pages of text and more than 300 amendments, saying that he does not like it in such a form, and will write a new one? I cannot. Because, I am sure, he would not finish voicing this idea as U.S. President. Such statements by our president, however, are greeted with cheers. This is pouring fuel on the flames.

What is behind all this, of course, are not contradictions in the Constitution. No, what is behind it are the contradictions between the president's reforms and the real life of the people, the absence of a unified concept of Russian revival. This is why at the referendum I will strike out "yes" in reply to the first two questions, and "no" in reply to the others.

I will do this in the hope that new people in power will not preach an ideology of ruining Russia but will concentrate their efforts in the interests of its people and the true elevation of the country.

Regional Affairs

Presidential Decree Sets Early Chechen Elections

LD2904063093 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English
0624 GMT 29 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS special correspondent Kharchenko]

[Text] Groznyy April 29—President of Chechnya Dzhokhar Dudayev, appearing on local television late Wednesday [28 April] evening, announced the signing of a decree for early parliamentary elections this September. Dudayev also announced that the presidential rule he introduced April 17 will last until the parliamentary elections take place.

Dudayev also made public a decree to dissolve the city assembly of Groznyy, which was elected to solve local matters. "In practice, the city assembly of Groznyy has systematically violated the constitution and other legislative acts", the president added.

Chechnya Constitutional Court Calls For End to Fighting

LD2804222993 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service
in Russian 1159 GMT 28 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS special correspondent Aleksandr Kharchenko]

[Excerpt] Groznyy, 28 Apr (ITAR-TASS)—The Chechnya Constitutional Court today called on Chechnya's leaders and all healthy forces in the nation to follow the requirements of the Chechnya Constitution and halt the confrontation. "The Chechnya Constitutional Court has exhausted virtually all the ways and means of bringing the executive and legislative authorities to reason and return their actions and decisions to the path of a constitutional, law-based solution to the conflict situations," says a statement by the court's chairman, Ikhvan Gerikhanov. "The attempts to get the president and the chairman of the republic's parliament to sit down at the negotiating table have not been successful. The reason is the lack of desire—and that's all." "The freedom and independence achieved by the people have become small change in the hands of individual top state officials who are attempting to hold on to their leading positions. Each of the sides, referring to the opinion of the rally and warning about responsibility for possible bloodshed, at the same time are rattling the sabers of which the demonstrators have more than enough. And this is the result—on 24 April 1993 blood was split," the statement says. "Each of the sides must compromise. Both the executive and legislative authorities must understand that only a legal solution to conflicts is the way to the future, the way out of the dead-end," it notes. [passage omitted]

Anti-Dudayev Rallies Continue in Chechnya Despite Ban

LD2804134093 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English
1205 GMT 28 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS special correspondent Aleksandr Kharchenko]

[Text] Groznyy April 28 TASS—Military commandant of Chechnya Salman Khasimikov issued an order banning all rallies and manifestations in Chechnya from April 28, but opponents of President Dzhokhar Dudayev said they will not obey.

The rally was allowed by the city authorities of Groznyy, while the parliament cancelled the state of emergency, organisers of the anti-Dudayev rally said. They do not fear an armed attack on them and said they are set to resolve the crisis by constitutional means.

Supporters of Dudayev agree to end their rally only in case his opponents follow suit. Isa Arsamikov, a Chechen legislator who handed in his mandate, told TASS that "not a single person will remain" at pro-Dudayev's rally if the opposition obeys the order of the military commandant.

The Chechen Constitutional Court admitted that it had exhausted all methods and means to reconcile the president and parliament. "Attempts to bring them to the table of negotiations failed for only one reason - the absence of any wish", Ikhvan Gerikhanov, the chief justice, said in a statement on Wednesday [28 April].

"Each of the sides has to look for a compromise", he said adding that a lawful solution of the conflict is the only way to the future.

Chelyabinsk Elects New Oblast Head Despite Yeltsin Edict

PM2804131793 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA
in Russian 28 Apr 93 First Edition p 1

[Report from "ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA-ITAR-TASS" column: "People of Chelyabinsk Choose Governor—Petr Sumin"]

[Text] Along with the referendum, people in Chelyabinsk were also voting in the runoff for head of the oblast administration.

The gubernatorial election went ahead despite protests from the Prosecutor's Office and rulings from the oblast court, which had declared it illegal. And now, despite the Russian presidential edict reaffirming the powers of former administration head Vadim Solov'yev, the people of Chelyabinsk have yet another governor—Petr Sumin, the current chairman of the oblast soviet.

Kalmyk President Recounts Meeting With Yeltsin

LD2804204793 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1700 GMT 28 Apr 93

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] [Correspondent Yevgeniy Fadeyev] President Kirsan Ilyumzhinov, the youngest president in the world, held his first news conference today in Moscow. At 31 years of age he was recently been elected first president of the Republic of Kalmykia in a nationwide election. Kirsan calls himself a capitalist. Others call him a multi-millionaire or even a billionaire. He already has his own fortune. Now he wants to make the whole of Kalmykia happy. He does, moreover, see the republic's prosperity only within a united democratic mighty Russian Federation.

He shocked many with his first decrees. He made himself head of state, abolished the Ministry of State Security in Kalmykia, and two days ago dissolved the government, sending 40 ministers into retirement. Now only five remain.

On 30 April, he stated, the republic's Supreme Soviet will assemble to dissolve itself. On that same day soviets of all levels will cease to exist on the territory of Kalmykia. In the fall, elections are to be held to a professional parliament which will consist of 25 people in all.

The newly elected president refused financial support from Moscow. Whereas formerly the republic was 95 percent funded by subsidies from Russia, now it will earn its own living.

Kirsan Ilyumzhinov reported that he had an hour-long conversation with Boris Yeltsin today, during which he proposed making Kalmykia an original testing ground for introducing presidential rule in the country, and for implementing other political and economic reforms.

[Fadeyev, addressing Ilyumzhinov] What did the Russian president think of that idea?

[Ilyumzhinov] He thought it was good, he regarded it positively. I said: Boris Nikolayevich, we do not need to repeat the mistakes that we made after the State Committee for the State of Emergency. Now since the victory in the referendum is already obvious, we must therefore step up the pace. And Kalmykia will serve as an example for this.

Paper Hints at Kalmyk Leader's 'Compromising Material'

PM2604150193 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 24 Apr 93 p 3

[A. Yevtushenko account of interview with Kirsan Ilyumzhinov, president-elect of Republic of Kalmykia; place and date not given: "Crown of Kalmyk President. Toward Kirsan Ilyumzhinov's Inauguration"]

[Text] April is generously endowed with birthdays of celebrities: Lenin and Hitler, Zhirinovskiy and Pugachev.... The future president of the Republic of Kalmykia—the billionaire Kirsan Ilyumzhinov—was also born 5 April 1962. He lived in the house of his father, a party worker on a local scale. The house was small by present standards. He graduated from Elista's ordinary secondary school with a gold medal. He went to work in a local plant as an ordinary fitter. He did his army service not far from home, in the North Caucasus Military District. He went back through "the plant gates that gave me my start in life." They really did do so. They gave him not only the status of a proletarian, which was so handy when entering the elite Moscow State Institute of International Relations, and excellent references as an ordinary working guy and Komsomol [All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League] activist but also a green light into the CPSU. And then into the USSR Supreme Soviet as a deputy.

"Has fortune really not once turned her back on you throughout your life?" I asked Kirsan while sitting with him in the spacious interior of his vast Lincoln.

"In the fifth year I was almost expelled from the institute and from the party. This was in 1988. There is no denying that at the time I liked both 'living it up' with friends in discotheques and sitting in restaurants (this happens now, too). There were 'well-wishers'—they denounced me."

Many people were gathering compromising material on Ilyumzhinov—ranging from the secretary of the institute's party committee to comrades from the Lubyanka.

Kirsan did not say how he managed, nonetheless, to wriggle out from under that surveillance with no particular losses. But, as can be seen, even then he had mastered the art of getting out of trouble in time. Either his passion for chess helped, or it was something else. Incidentally, about his passions. For Ilyumzhinov another hobby—personal acquaintances with celebrities of various kinds—was probably even greater than the ancient game. His "star collection" included Yuriy Shatunov and Galina Starovoytova, who both came to Elista for the presidential election. One of the greatest places of honor on this list belongs to Gary Kasparov, whose acquaintance Kirsan made on buying from him the crown of the world chess champion.

Kasparov had announced at the presentation ceremony that he was intending to sell the crown, thereby shocking everyone present. On learning that the money for it would be handed over to the people who had suffered from the interethnic conflicts in Baku, Kirsan offered Gary his services. A deal was struck. According to some information, for 10 million rubles [R]; according to other information, Ilyumzhinov paid out more than \$1 million in cash for the 1.5-kg crown of gold and diamonds.

[Yevtushenko] Where is the world champion's crown now?

[Ilyumzhinov] I have placed it in my own personal safe in one of the most reliable Swiss banks. Let it lie there for now. For it does not ask to eat.

[Yevtushenko] You have presented a motor vehicle and several million rubles to the Union of Cossacks, and the rank of lieutenant colonel has been conferred upon you. You have allocated money to a buddhist commune, and its holy fathers extol you as the messiah. Your subsidies have reduced food prices, you invited at your own expense a whole slew of variety "stars" (according to certain information, they alone cost something of the order of R30 million)—and you became president. Obviously, money is everything to you?

[Ilyumzhinov] It is no longer of interest to me personally. I do not even know how much money I have. I know that I have a very great deal. Even business, particularly of late, has been more of a distraction for me. I have now gotten away from it entirely. More than 50 diverse enterprises of the "San" Corporation, which I head, operate on my capital.

The Cossacks accepted me into their union as a hereditary Cossack back in 1990. My grandfather Kirsan fought in the civil war on the Don in the 1st Cavalry Army. As regards my help for the Buddhist commune.... I myself am a Buddhist, although I respect any religion. Our holy Dalai Lama came to Kalmykia at my invitation. In the very near future I, as president of the republic, intend to invite him to take up permanent residence here and to grant him political asylum.

[Yevtushenko] It is said that you have suggested that another social outcast—Russian ex-Premier Yegor Gaidar—also move to Kalmykia?

[Ilyumzhinov] Yes. And he has promised to think about it. Gaidar became a hostage in a political game. He was sacrificed the way a piece is sacrificed in order to avoid defeat. [Ilyumzhinov ends]

In reply to a question about the R14 billion transferred by Russia to Kalmykia to buy wool from the population—money which became part of the turnover of the "Step" commercial bank founded by Ilyumzhinov, as Russian Deputy Mikhail Bocharov said on local television, brandishing a sheaf of documents—Kirsan said: "Lies, slander." He said the same, incidentally, about the 40,000 tonnes of fuel oil which the "San" Corporation sold abroad illegally for \$1 million—information from the same source. I. Bugdayev, chairman of the Kalmyk Supreme Soviet, and M. Mukubenov, chairman of the republic Council of Ministers, officially appealed to the Russian vice president for assistance in respect of these fuel oil dollars. As is known, A. Rutskoy—a fellow member of the International Russian Club along with Bocharov (and also V. Ochirov, the second presidential hopeful in Kalmykia)—set things in motion. So maybe Ilyumzhinov had an ulterior motive in running so energetically—and successfully—for the presidency. For the activist of the "Smena-New Policy" faction in the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet must have known what

storm clouds were gathering above him. Now, elected by the whole people, he has a status of immunity that is higher than a deputy's.

Mordovia Votes Against Yeltsin in Referendum

LD2804135893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1228 GMT 28 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Aleksey Papeta]

[Text] Saransk April 28 TASS—Mordovia, a republic within Russia, whose parliament has recently cancelled the post of the republican president, voted against Boris Yeltsin at a referendum last Sunday.

The final results show that the turnout was 70.2 per cent and only 38 per cent voted confidence to Yeltsin. 35 per cent supported his economic reform course.

41.9 and 35.9 per cent want early presidential and parliamentary elections correspondingly.

Yeltsin has cancelled the Mordovian decision to cancel the post of the president, however chairman of the vote-counting commission of Mordovia Viktor Kabayev told TASS it is wrong to link the results of the referendum to Yeltsin's move. "Our people voted according to the way they assess the situation in Russia, in their region, the policy of the federal government which has been marking time for long", he said.

Novosibirsk Oblast Referendum Results Released

LD2904084593 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0200 gmt 29 apr 93

[Text] The results of Sunday's referendum voting have already been summed up in some regions, including Novosibirsk Oblast. Tamara Ventsemerova reports:

[Ventsemerova] Summing up the results of the voting, the constituency electoral commission reported that 1,265,000 inhabitants of Novosibirsk Oblast had taken part. To the first question on confidence in the president, an affirmative answer was given by 54.5 percent, while 42.2 percent replied in the negative. The voting on support for economic reform resulted in 48.6 percent voting in favor, with almost as many voters being against. To the question on the reelection of the president, 32.9 percent voted in favor, while 26.3 percent voted against. By the way, this question gave rise to the greatest number of spoilt ballot papers—43,000. To the question on early elections for the body of deputies, 42.1 percent of the electorate voted in favor.

Observers from public organizations, parties and movements were present at all polling stations.

North Ossetian, Ingushetian Situation Remains 'Complex'

LD2804163693 Moscow *ITAR-TASS in English* 1335 GMT 28 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Valeriy Shanayev]

[Text] Vladikavkaz April 28 TASS—The situation in the zone of the state of emergency in territories of North Ossetia and Ingushetia remains extremely complex. Clashes, killings of peaceful people and servicemen, the seizure of hostages became more frequent, General Yuriy Savenkov, chief of staff of the provisional administration, told ITAR-TASS. Savenkov said that chiefs of the provisional administrative and the Military Council take urgent measures to reinforce checkpoints and ensure safety of the population of frontline districts.

ITAR-TASS learned that on the night from Tuesday [27 April] to Wednesday fire was opened more than once on a camp pitched in Nazran, Ingushetia. Staffers of the investigating group of the Russian Interior Ministry are staying in that camp. A unit returned the fire. There are no immediate reports about casualties.

The Press Centre of the North Ossetian Parliament on Wednesday circulated a letter of Statislav Suyanov, deputy chairman of the North Ossetian Parliament, to Ingush President Ruslan Aushev. The letter says that from April 9 to April 25 Ingush extremists staged acts of brutality in the North Ossetian territory regarding citizens of North Ossetia, killing nine people, wounding four and seizing seven. "These vicious provocations are aimed at enhancing animosity between the peoples of our republics", the statement says. The North Ossetian Parliament protests against these crimes, demands their investigation and punishment of those guilty and the prevention of further encroachments on the security of citizens of sovereign North Ossetia, the letter says.

Shevchenko Uranium Enrichment Plant Profiled

PM2904082193 Moscow *Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian* 1300 GMT 26 Apr 93

[By unidentified correspondent; from the "Atomic Power Engineering Without Secrets" documentary]

[Text] The eastern shore of the Caspian has never been particularly fit for human habitation. That notwithstanding, a city sprang up here. It appears on maps as the city of Shevchenko. The mass media never talked about the output of the Caspian mining and metallurgical combine, whose very existence is the city's *raison d'être*. And that was hardly surprising. There does not seem to be any metal there, and it's a long way out. In actual fact there was no metal nearby. There was uranium.

Until recently there would have been amazement had anyone turned up here with a movie camera. While the first film crews were amazed in their turn at the tremendous amount of equipment and its impressive capabilities. The uranium forms a thin layer around a meter

thick at a depth of 80-100 meters on an ancient seabed that has absorbed the bones of its prehistoric inhabitants. Indeed, as the poet said, there is a tonne of ore in every gram of radium.

The ore is hauled off in dump trucks. One after the other they empty their load. Here we have the usual unloading process. The trucks travel to the railroad siding. Here the ore is transferred to dump cars. It's just like any other quarry where the ore is extracted by the open-cast method. There are no special safety measures, no special conditions or systems apart from the run-of-the-mill work clothes and the usual operating regulations.

It is not convicts who work here or people on death row, as legend and conjecture had it. It was a legend that arose there with no basis in truth. It is ordinary people like you and me, reliable professionals and specialists, many of whom have lived here for decades, had children, and have no intention of changing profession who work here.

That mundane feeling disappears when these installations rise up on the approach to the city. This is a water distillation installation. The plant operates using nuclear power. It turns seawater into drinking water. The plant has brought life to this desert thanks to atomic energy. These security fences leave no room for doubt. Everything involving nuclear power requires increased attention and needs to be protected against accidents.

The dump car train goes into the bunkers. The ore pours out and travels down conveyor belts to the workshop.

The process is so humdrum and prosaic that even for an outsider this uranium ore completely loses its special aura. It is only here in the workshop that the notorious grams of uranium will be extracted from the ore. There are many stages to this work and it is a lengthy, monotonous process. But it requires care. Electronics deal with the task of supervising many processes; they do not suffer from monotony-induced fatigue.

The workshop is almost deserted, but it is pretty noisy. The mills and drums turn constantly, crushing the ore into powder. It is rinsed over and over in a flotation shop. It is repeatedly filtered by special devices.

This yellow powder is virtually pure uranium. It pours into small containers to be transported in small doses to places where it will be turned into nuclear fuel.

The uranium is turned into fuel here in the workshops of the mechanical plant in the city of Elektrostal near Moscow. The process begins with the uranium powder being poured into even smaller containers and carefully mixed. The powder is blended with a plasticized compound [plastikat], condensed, compressed, and formed into these tablets. This process is controlled electronically, but in areas where use of the world's most indispensable instrument—the human hand—cannot be avoided everything is done in a vacuum. When making the tablets it is necessary to ensure that they correspond not only to precise dimensions but also to a highly

precise geometry—that is, the shape of the tablets. The smooth surface is quite impeccable, this result being attained through long and careful polishing.

Here we are at the recovery shop. Not a single speck of dust or piece of old rag will be allowed outside the enterprise until they have been totally deuraniumized. The particles of uranium that are found are taken back to the production unit. They are collected together in a container and are then treated in the same way as the uranium from the combine. They are measured out, mixed, dried, and compressed. One of these spoonfuls of powder can take the place of a tonne of coal.

There must not be the slightest variation in the clearance between the tablets and the inner surface of the tube. That is why manufacturing the tubes is no simple process. They are manufactured using a special metal, which comparatively recently was considered a precious metal—zirconium. It is an equally essential safety condition that the tubes be hermetically sealed. That is why the process during which the tubes are sealed and covered with special varnishes is supervised very carefully. Not even a molecule of feed water must enter the tube, henceforth known as a fuel element.

I must also mention another element in the security measures. Take note. Not only are there virtually no people in the workshop, but there no slogans, appeals, or posters either. People here work calmly and smoothly, there are never any rush jobs or failures to meet schedules. There is no need for appeals or propaganda!

The tubes are assembled in strictly prescribed quantities and dispatched to nuclear power station reactors.

Depending on the type of the reactor, they are assembled in a rectangular or circular array and are known as assemblies [sborki].

Here are the assemblies that you saw at the beginning of the film. Only these are at the end of their existence. But this is just the beginning for the others. From here these assemblies go straight from the workshop in special packaging and containers by special transport to various nuclear power stations.

Agricultural Decline in Maritime Kray Reported

LD2804082093

[Editorial Report] Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian at 0253 GMT on 28 April carries a three-minute report by correspondent Oleg Padenko from Vladivostok, who reports that the sowing campaign is in full swing in Maritime Kray. He observes that credits for purchasing everything that farmers need were to have been allocated in December, but so far they have not received a single kopeck. He reports that taxes are high, and there are insufficient combined fodders and medicines for cattle, which is why cattle plague is on the increase.

Padenko says: "I have here in front of me a statistical review for the first quarter that was published literally today. It says specifically that volumes of production of the main kinds of livestock produce dropped in the first quarter by 17-32 percent compared with last year. Also, purchases of poultry fell by 13 percent, of milk by 23 percent, and of eggs by 47 percent".

Padenko continues: "Many firms are collapsing, not because of competition but because of the impossibility of normally conducting business."

International Affairs

Kravchuk Speech to Cossacks Focuses on Nuclear Power Status

PM2804161993 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
29 Apr 93 First Edition p 2

[Sergey Tsikora report: "Ukrainian President's Speech to Cossacks"]

[Text] Kiev—The details of Ukrainian President L. Kravchuk's speech to members of the general council of senior officers [starshina], elders, and kray hetmans of the Ukrainian Cossacks have become known.

Journalists were not invited to this meeting. Only the newspaper URYADOVYY KURYER, the organ of Ukraine's state executive, provided a detailed report of what occurred. The striking thing is that this official report devotes a considerable amount of space not to the problems of the resurgence of the Ukrainian Cossack community—the reason for the meeting between the president and the Cossacks—but a quite different issue: whether Ukraine should be a nuclear power.

The topic of nuclear weapons has been discussed for some time now at closed plenary sessions and in the permanent commissions of the Supreme Soviet. parliamentarians have not yet formulated a common opinion. The Ukrainian president's position is becoming increasingly interesting, especially the tone in which it is couched. Here is a word-for-word translation from the Ukrainian of the section of L. Kravchuk's speech in which he talks about Ukraine's nuclear weapons:

We want the world to respect us not just as a great and strong power, but first and foremost as a power that pursues a considered and sensible policy. This is how we should approach the issue of whether Ukraine should be a nuclear power. In our declaration of independence we proclaimed the nonnuclear status of our country. And we were subsequently accepted throughout the world as a nonnuclear power.

Of course we can change direction, but we need suitable grounds for doing so. For Ukraine, which in practically every way was a part of the military imperialist complex which constituted the former USSR, such grounds do not exist. We will not be able to independently maintain [obespechivat] the nuclear weapons we possess. It is beyond our competence to establish our own closed cycle, which is mandatory for any nuclear power. The warheads stationed on our territory are controlled from Russia and fitted out by the Russian side. In order to develop [sozdat] our own nuclear warhead we would have to spend \$25 billion according to preliminary estimates. Moreover, as soon as Ukraine proclaimed its status as a nuclear state, fuel supplies for our nuclear electric power stations would be discontinued the very next day. Since we have little coal and only our neighbor has oil and gas, shutting down our nuclear electric power stations would inflict enormous damage on our entire

economy and bring it almost to a standstill. This is the situation. We should understand that nobody except Russia will give us a gram of oil, and Russia basically supplies our gas as well. We are in debt to our neighbors, since we cannot settle up for everything on time. Only Russia will give us credit for fuel, although, understandably, it dictates its own terms.

So how are we to get out of the situation that has developed? By looking for exclusively political ways of resolving problems, showing flexibility, and not ruling out compromise—otherwise we will not survive.

I would like very much, L. Kravchuk noted, for the Cossack movement to take a constructive line and uphold positions which will enable us to preserve our dignity and honor.

Foreign Ministry: Kostenko's Remarks on Nukes Not Official Position

LD2804155593 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service
in Ukrainian 1500 GMT 28 Apr 93

[Text] We received a statement from the Ukrainian Foreign Ministry press center today. It refers in particular to articles in a number of domestic and foreign mass media on 27 and 28 April of this year which reflect the view of Yuriy Kostenko, leader of the special working group of deputies for preparing for ratification of the START I Treaty and environment minister, that Ukraine is a nuclear state.

In this connection, the Foreign Ministry's press center is authorized to state that if the declaration corresponds to reality, this statement of Ukraine's stance does not reflect the official position, and should be considered the personal opinion of Yuriy Kostenko.

National Affairs

Kuchma Discusses Economy, Policy, Ethics

AU2904111993 Kiev HOLOS UKRAYINY in Ukrainian
24 Apr 93 pp 2, 3

[Interview with Prime Minister Leonid Kuchma by Serhiy Pravdenko, HOLOS UKRAYINY editor in chief; place and date not given: "We Have Not Come Here in Order To Give In"]

[Text] [Pravdenko] Leonid Danylovych, every working person probably has his own ideal of an enterprise or a plant. I picture our industrial enterprise like this. The majority of or even the entire labor collective is the co-owner of the enterprise and possesses a control package of shares. It is clear that a collective consisting of 5,000, 10,000, or 40,000 persons cannot manage an enterprise. It elects the brightest people from among their numbers—the council of shareholders. This council hires a directorial (managerial) team and puts a strategic task before it specifying to what level it must raise the given production and what it must achieve in the social

sphere. If something goes wrong, the shareholders' council renews the legislative structures. What is your ideal?

[Kuchma] In the long run, I agree: The master must hire a manager. If he is a true master, he will never hire anybody through backstairs influence. According to efficiency only. He will hire a person who has brains and who will really ensure profit.

[Pravdenko] When you say "master," do you mean collective or... I am talking about collective lease with redeemability as a good road toward privatization. I think that this is a socially reasonable path that our people may understand. A path that does not deprive a skilled worker of the right and possibility to become a working owner....

[Kuchma] Yes, I support this idea. It must really be implemented. However, this must be done taking into account the fact that one person works at a powerful enterprise with expensive fixed assets, while another—at what may be referred to as a "shady concern" or some office where fixed assets amount to next to nothing.

[Pravdenko] Are you familiar with the Czech privatization experience?

[Kuchma] No.

[Pravdenko] It is quite interesting. Our newspaper published three articles on it. The Czechs put an enterprise up for auction, and if there are too many people willing to invest their privatization papers in it, the state removes that enterprise from the auction and raises the price. If there are too few people, it also takes it off the auction and lowers the price. In this manner, both the optimal price and the privatization mechanism are found through the market.

[Kuchma] In principle, I am in favor of auction sales. However, some mechanisms must be elaborated for protecting the interests of labor collectives. If everything is simply handed over to the collective—this would mean overlooking too many people in the nonproductive sphere. Consequently, you and I share the same idea, but the mechanism must be elaborated. If it is announced today: 'Everyone who works is already a shareholder'—this will change nothing.

Noticeable changes are particularly well seen at small enterprises. There, the abilities of every person can be seen. For example, today, on collective farms, where shares have been distributed, nobody wants to see lazy people or drunkards among the shareholders. Here, as I became convinced during a trip to farms, very much depends upon the chairmen.

[Pravdenko] Strange things are taking place in our Privatization. An enterprise is put in an auction sale at one place, there is another attempt somewhere else, and some forces act. What is behind all of this? Do we have a definite privatization strategy?

[Kuchma] I have the impression that the Cabinet of Ministers keeps aloof from this process. First, the State Property Fund is not subordinated to the Cabinet. It is subordinated to the Supreme Council. In my opinion, all administration of property must be in the hands of the executive power.

[Pravdenko] Does it seem to you that auctions are a legalization of shadow capital and that they are bad because they may lead to a social explosion and a confrontation?

[Kuchma] I am of a different opinion on the subject. I believe that auction sales must be sanctioned and legalized by decree. All shadow dealers must be amnestied. Then they will be under control and will work for the state and not against it.

[Pravdenko] How does one find that borderline, so that the interests of the labor collectives will not suffer and those who can invest their capital in enterprises will do so?

[Kuchma] A labor collective will only be grateful if a real master comes and starts working and thinking about the future of the production. Let us think jointly—both the executive and legislative power—how to find the borderline and not cause interests to clash, so that we will be led by expediency and not by populism.

[Pravdenko] The main task is, probably, not new: To overcome the alienation of the workers from the means of production.

[Kuchma] Of course, it is the main thing. However, it will take more than one or two years to overcome this.

[Pravdenko] However, many of our deputies advocate an idealistic approach: Let us sell everything to the private sector, have everything privatized over one or two years, and then life will become good.

[Kuchma] This is an idyll. Manilovism [Manilov is the hero of Gogol's "Dead Souls" and is characterized by inactivity]. Even in countries with market conditions, it took some major branches between 10 and 15 years to undergo privatization. Moreover, foreign recipes of market models of transition to the market are not suitable for us. They forgot how much time they themselves polished their market.

[Pravdenko] Only yesterday, you were director of a huge enterprise. What is your attitude to the present directors' corps and to the corps of [collective farm] chairmen? My attitude is, for example, negative. Because, nowadays, the directors of those enterprises that extract raw materials and also metallurgists and others frequently do anything they want. They consider themselves to be great managers. One of them probably trades in raw materials abroad, but he already looks upon himself as a great businessman. Then, having sold rolled metal and pipes, he purchases video recorders and manufactured goods for his collective and is cherished as a father, without,

however, thinking about the development of the production. He also advances claims upon the government: Provide us with credits and state orders and ensure economic ties for us. This means that the mentality is the same: To go to the governmental offices and demand. At the same time, he thinks little about what he himself can and must restructure under the conditions. I am asking about this because the government's plan for actions envisions contracts with directors. Is not this a way of conserving the old directors' cadres? Those directors who are fulfilling the role of traffic controllers at their plants and do not know of any other role? Perhaps, leasing with redeemability, privatization, councils of shareholders, and the hiring of directors by them will make it possible to naturally strengthen the directors' corps from below?

[Kuchma] Of course, we need new forces and new people here. We have them, and they must be promoted. However, in principle, I have relied and will rely upon the directors' corps, because, at present, there is no other force. I met with many of them. While I would not even want to sit next to some of the directors, others may be talented people.

[Pravdenko] Well, labor collectives will keep talented directors. For example, I know a brilliant director in Kharkiv. He told me long ago: "My dream is of a collective that becomes an owner and hires me."

[Kuchma] Yes, there are many talented people among machine builders. You know, they do not make much ado. They work. Their situation is particularly difficult.

[Pravdenko] However, some directors are only demanding that the government provide well-defined ties and guarantee their inviolability. That is to say, such a director had ties with Russian plants and he now demands that everything remain as before. He sends the products to the CIS without having either agreements or advance payments. In Russia and in its government, the argument is this: You yourself sent the products to bankrupts, so what do you want? All your demands must be addressed to them. We at the editorial office are still receiving protests from directors: Demand, through your newspaper, that the Cabinet of Ministers cancel advance payment issue. Must we send products to bankrupts? Is this better?

[Kuchma] This is done by those members of the directors' corps who do not want to work or are unable to work.

[Pravdenko] What measures can be taken to improve the situation?

[Kuchma] We will not conclude contracts with such leaders. We must conduct the contract campaign in such a way as to avoid favoritism or formal attitudes.

[Pravdenko] Does that mean that you will try to spread influence from above, until lower-level cadres mature?

[Kuchma] The situation at the lower-level is difficult. Collectives are in distress. Everybody fears impending unemployment. Just try and contradict the director—you will be out the next day. On the other hand, such a director does not realize that the worse the collective's performance, the more people will, in the final analysis, find themselves out of work.

[Pravdenko] Still, an owner-collective will do a better job than any ministry in choosing a director.

[Kuchma] Perhaps. Metallurgists propose that the process of introducing shares be accelerated.

[Pravdenko] All of this in the conditions of their expensive and worn-out fixed assets.

[Kuchma] Yes, that is why it is necessary to lift the veto that was imposed upon the Decree on Privatization. This must be started from below and not from above. However, steps must be balanced. You remember, we used to reduce ministries. It turned out to be a great stupidity. Because, in principle, we did not change anything in the system, but ministries and committees only converted their signboards into those of corporations and concerns and lost control of enterprises. Changes must be of evolutionary nature. It is now time to introduce shares and shareholding enterprises. They will withdraw from ministries. Ministries must gradually die off and dry out. However, the part of them that is responsible for strategy must remain. It is necessary. For example, suppose that we are building a house, but do not manufacture windowpanes or doors. Some people find this unprofitable. This results in problems. Everything in the economy must be coordinated and designed in such a way as to make it profitable, so that not a single link falls out of the chain.

As regards collective farms, I am categorically against disbanding them. This is despite the fact that I myself repeatedly said and repeat now: In the form in which they now exist they constitute serfdom. I had a meeting with a farmer, and he said: "Give us land and not in different places, but plot next to plot, and we will unite, although on an entirely different basis. Farmers are in favor of introducing land taxation. They are right. We must support both farmers and the collective farms. People will make their own choice."

[Pravdenko] I want to ask you about something else. We have some horrible and, in my opinion, quite artificial, rate of the coupon relative to the dollar or to any other freely convertible currency. This rate does not conform to realities of either the market or marketplace. Where has it been taken? How can it be explained? To me, it is some artificial action with regard to us and with regard to Russia.

[Kuchma] I agree with this. The rate is artificial. Obviously, there are external forces both inside the country and outside its borders. They sweeten the bait, so that it may be swallowed here.

[Pravdenko] Thus, there are, apparently, too many forces in highly developed countries that want to turn the expanses of the former USSR into a cheap raw materials base?

[Kuchma] Yes. You remember that at the beginning of perestroika, all Democrats spoke and even yelled that Communists and the leadership of the former Union sold out our raw materials?

[Pravdenko] We are doing the same.

[Kuchma] On a much larger scale. When the next generation comes and sees what we have done over this period of time, I think that everybody will feel bad about it. I recently said at a news conference that we must be reimbursed for at least a small part in dollars, even in the form of interest-free credits. It would be a partial compensation for what has been taken away from us for free. Unfortunately, it is continuing.

[Pravdenko] What is, in your opinion, the reason for certain clumsiness of the Cabinet of Ministers and of ministries in external economic activity? I accompanied the president many times in his trips and saw that protocols of intentions were made, then quite good agreements were concluded, but later all of this got buried somewhere in the establishment. When two or three months later you ask whether a particular agreement works, it turns out that it does not. Why? How to make this mechanism function? We will simply be given up as unreliable partners.

[Kuchma] We lack professionalism, because we virtually never had anything to do with it. Everything was concentrated in Moscow. Second, officials are not interested, and, third, responsibility has been abandoned completely. For example, one writes a resolution: "work out," "report," or "introduce" certain proposals. If you do not remind them and make a note of this, you will have to wait a long time for the fulfillment. In the West, an incompetent official will be immediately sacked, whereas I, as prime minister, cannot dismiss a deputy minister who does not work properly. Because in accordance with an obsolete law, I must offer him another position, and, if he does not want it, it may result in devil only knows what....

[Pravdenko] Therefore, we urgently need laws on the Cabinet of Ministers and on the state service.

[Kuchma] Certainly. Besides, it is not prestigious now to be a state official. There is little money in it. That is why there are few people who serve their fatherland. There are more of those who serve themselves. Hence, we have the various types of abuse. Criticism also pushed them to this by accusing them of idleness. An analysis shows that officials in any country are well paid and enjoy respect. There are 7,000 persons at the French Institute of the Economy. We, however, are still unable to comprehend that we now control not just 4 or 5 percent of Ukraine's economy, as it was in the times of the Union, but the entire country and its entire economy. We think that the

minister must be like an Uncle Vasyl with a cudgel and that is all. However, a ministry is a brain trust.

[Pravdenko] If I am not mistaken, you are now discussing centralization of leadership as a way to stabilize the economy. Does it seem to you that we already had this, and that we must not follow this path, and that it is impossible to step into the same river twice?

[Kuchma] No, it does not. We do not walk into the same river. We did not and will not set such a task. It is unrealistic, impossible, and the main thing is that it is harmful. What are we talking about today? That the director of any state enterprise is a manager on behalf of the state. The state must hire him and make demands upon him. In 1991 and 1992, nothing was demanded, the system was destroyed, and everybody is now doing anything he wants, not acting in the state's interests. At best, he only works in the interests of his own enterprise. This is very bad. The interests of the enterprise and of the state have become unbalanced. However, there are state agreements; they exist all over the world, and they are controlled by the state. That is why there must be a nationwide program, that is to say, a certain part of the enterprise's efforts must be under the state's control, but the state will not interfere in the remaining part. However, there must be this part [controlled by the state]. To govern, one must have all of this, clearly know what may be counted upon, and also see what every enterprise may contribute to the budget. So far, instead of such cooperation with the government, the attitude toward it is in line with the known Japanese principle when a dummy of the manager is placed in the entrance hall and whoever wishes may beat it up. That is why I think like this: Unless we work as one team and have full coordination, things will get even worse. Both the deputies and the directors must cooperate with the government, more specifically they must recommend and implement things that are useful for the state and for an improvement of the economy and not speak on behalf of branches or enterprises that make claims upon a certain part of the budget pie that is diminishing.

[Pravdenko] Our departmental ministries are engaged in privatizing enterprises. However, they are not enemies to themselves and they understand that as more privatized enterprises emerge, a particular ministry will have to change its functions to a greater extent.

[Kuchma] This is already not quite so. The Fund for Property is dealing with privatization. There are also differences between the ministries and the Fund. The Fund does not ask ministries what to do, but it determines on its own what is to be privatized. That is why, today, the results of its work equal zero....

[Pravdenko] It seems to me that there is not enough clarity in privatization. We do not sufficiently explain the essence of the program to the people, how it is being fulfilled, and by what methods.

[Kuchma] I agree with you. This is also a reproach for me. People who work with me were not planning to become

premiers, vice premiers, or ministers. We do not have enough qualified cadres, especially economists, and especially in the sphere of microeconomy. Many people criticize Viktor Pynzenyk, but he is an intelligent and talented person. However, there are not many such people. We make mistakes. We have only just started dealing with serious programs. It is true, however, that people often do not know what we are doing today. That main thing is what we are going to do tomorrow, in a week, in a month, or in a year. There must be a strategy. There must be a goal. We see our shortcomings. We are correcting them as much as we can, but we need cooperation and assistance on the part of all healthy forces in our society.

[Pravdenko] Our economy is more adapted to raw materials branches. We extract much from the earth and process a great deal. Unfortunately, regarding output, we do not have very much. What can be done in our conditions, have any trends been outlined?

[Kuchma] The restructuring of the economy is a huge task. We have undertaken to resolve it. There are many problems. Some enterprises must be closed down or subjected to radical reprofiling. Besides, we must think of creating new work positions. It will be very difficult to coordinate this process.

[Pravdenko] It seems to me that we have forgotten the experience of the National Economic Council, which might now be quite useful. Precisely they tried to produce, in the given region, what was profitable under the conditions and purchased elsewhere what they thought was unprofitable to manufacture locally. They avoided ties for the sake of ties.

[Kuchma] Experts in industrial restructuring must be given the green light. We are now elaborating a whole number of programs, mainly energy- and resources-conservation technologies. Nobody in our country has done anything serious in this sphere.

[Pravdenko] It may, therefore, be said that the government has practically started restructuring the economy?

[Kuchma] Yes, we started elaborating such programs.

[Pravdenko] You were the first in the whole country who spoke of the mafia and corruption....

[Kuchma] Well, this process is under way, whereas others are not.

[Pravdenko] It is steadily under way. Because powerful personal interests are involved. Doesn't it seem to you that it is time to transform the service for combating organized crime into a separate structure, for example, by creating a National Bureau for Combating the Mafia and Corruption, so that officers of that bureau should not be locally subordinated to anybody; so that they should not, in any way, depend upon any of the local authorities. The bureau must be directly subordinated to either the president or prime minister. I mean a service headed not necessarily by generals, but by experienced

and ambitious, still young and dynamic majors and lieutenant colonels. They have experience. Let them earn their general's stars by disclosing serious crimes.

[Kuchma] I am sure that this question is timely. We must create a National Bureau. People may understand mistakes made by the government, by the Supreme Council, or by the president, but they do not want, and rightly so, to reconcile themselves to the outburst of crime and corruption. Some people must be taken to this bureau from the Security Service and from the Sixth Administration at the Ministry of Internal Affairs, but these structures must also continue combating the mafia and corruption and do so in parallel.

[Pravdenko] Perhaps, we need precisely parallel and powerful structures, so that they would also overlap one another.

[Kuchma] Practical experience of such work is available in the world. For example, the United States has federal structures that are independent of local bodies.

[Pravdenko] Now, with your permission, a different theme. I cannot help touching upon it. The day of 9 May is approaching, and you were born before the war. What does this day mean to you?

[Kuchma] Indeed, I remember the war. This day is a joyous holiday for me, the best day of the spring, irrespective of the weather. On that day, our fathers defeated fascism and stopped perishing in the war. I am taking this opportunity to convey, through your newspaper, my kind regards to the veterans. Let them forgive us that we can do so little for them, having received such a difficult legacy in governing the state.

[Pravdenko] The last question. It is, perhaps, somewhat mystical. Doesn't it seem to you that God has punished the Slavs? Especially the eastern Slavs. In the 20th century, we have found ourselves in terrible shape. I am trying to think why. I am beginning to search my memory. Where else, outside the Russian empire, were czars hunted after the 1860's and where else was murder proclaimed as a good deed? The hunt was completed in 1918 by murdering children. What is particularly odd is that intellectuals became murderers. Then we began, in a concerted manner, to preach atheism. Isn't it for that reason that we have found ourselves where we are now? We are not lazy. Ukrainians, Russians, and others who emigrated tens of years ago presently occupy worthy places in those societies and in those countries. We are not more stupid than others. One unwittingly begins to think about redemption for the sins of murder and atheism. One perceives the social experiment of building a radiant future as God's punishment.

[Kuchma] Once you cross the border, there is a different world and a different mentality. There are also difficulties in many countries there. However, everybody wants to catch up with those who live better. Our mentality is as follows: The neighbor's cow has died. It is such a trifling matter, but pleasant anyway. For 70 years, fear

and envy have been inculcated in us. We have overcome fear, but envy has remained. It is so damaging.

I have recently noticed: Life in Western Ukraine and in Transcarpathia is much better. They construct beautiful buildings and everyday life there is richer. Why? Because they were involved in building the "radiant future" for less than 70 years.

[Pravdenko] Does the government intend to hold out and pursue its policy?

[Kuchma] We have not come here in order to give in. Our position is known. Today, the powers that the government has are insufficient. We must not only write decrees, but also have the strength and power to implement them. That is why, if we are correctly understood, we will work with pleasure. If somebody has new ideas and enthusiasm, come to us. We will always give support to bright and courageous people.

[Pravdenko] Thank you for the conversation.

Moldova

Sangheli Meets Clinton, Gore, Others in Washington

AU2304165093 Chisinau BASAPRESS in English
1950 GMT 22 Apr 93

[Text] Chisinau BASAPRESS, 22/4/1993—Yesterday, the prime minister of Moldova, Andrei Sangheli, who is now heading an official delegation from Moldova in the United States, had a meeting with the President of the USA, Bill Clinton, Vice President Al Gore and the adviser of President Clinton on problems of national security, Anthony Like, informs the press service of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The U.S.A. will offer constant assistance to support economic reforms and democratization processes in Moldova and will also contribute towards resolving the conflict from its Eastern regions in a peaceful way, clarified President Clinton.

In addition, yesterday, a bilateral agreement regarding the protection of capital investment was signed in Washington, stated the communique.

Snegur, Yeltsin To Discuss Conflict in Eastern Regions

AU2904102293 Chisinau BASAPRESS in English
1945 GMT 28 Apr 93

[Text] Chisinau, BASAPRESS 28/4/1993—The offering of a special statute for the Eastern regions and for those which are predominantly populated by Gagauzians could be accepted, clarified President Mircea Snegur during today's meeting with members of the SCEC [Security Council of the European Community] mission which is headed by Timothy Williams, stated the press service of the President. Snegur stated that the statute of localities which are densely populated by Gagauzians will be examined during the session of Parliament held in May and in the event of it being adopted, this could constitute a precedent for the Eastern regions. The President of Moldova also added that he had a telephone talk with President Boris Yeltsin during which they agreed to have a meeting in the near future and to discuss problems regarding the conflict from the Eastern regions, including the problems connected with political prisoners from Tiraspol.

Timothy Williams clarified that the mission he heads is performing a fact-finding visit and the SCEC expresses a special interest in Moldova, the leadership proving it looked forward to a durable peace settlement. "We did not come to teach you what to do," stated the Chief of the SCEC's Mission, underlining that "our goal is to become acquainted with the situation and at the same time to remain impartial.

Foreign Minister Receives Visiting EC Official

AU2804140793 Chisinau BASAPRESS in English
1855 GMT 27 Apr 93

[Text] Chisinau BASAPRESS, 27/4/1993—Nicolae Tiu, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Moldova, received Timothy Williams who is now heading a mission of the Security Council of the European Community which recently arrived in Chisinau as a result of efforts towards resolving in a peaceful way the crisis from the eastern regions of Moldova, stated a communique of the Mass Media Board of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The visit by that mission in Moldova indicated the interest which is expressed by this prestigious organization towards this country, Williams stated during the meeting. By clarifying that the leadership greatly relies upon the presence of the mission, Tiu assured its members that they will benefit from all the conditions which induce impartial and productive activity, communicated the Mass Media Board of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Snegur Comments on Demilitarization Plan, Dniester Problem

LD2704184093 Moscow Mayak Radio Network
in Russian 1530 GMT 27 Apr 93

[Text] Moldova plans to become a demilitarized state, but to do so it needs guarantees for stability in the Balkans. This was stated today by President Snegur in an interview to an American journalist. He expressed concern over the fact that leaders of the Dniester region are not reacting to Moldova's initiative until this region is granted special legal status.

Snegur Views Reestablishment of Social, Political Situation

AU2504172293 Chisinau BASAPRESS in English
1630 GMT 24 Apr 93

[Text] Chisinau, BASAPRESS, 24/4/1993—President Snegur affirmed in an interview offered to the Japanese newspaper "ASAHI" that the reestablishment of the social and political situation in Moldova is due to the cease fire in the eastern regions as a result of signing the convention from July 21st, with the president of Russia, Boris Yeltsin, states the press service of the president. Mircea Snegur declared that peacekeeping forces will be withdrawn during the moment when a special judicial status is adopted for the localities from the left side of Dniester. According to the president of Moldova, the adoption by Parliament of a status for localities that are densely populated by Gagauzians could also offer a precedent for the eastern regions whose population feels confident of unfavorable consequences from the political course of leaders from Tiraspol and who, however, do not renounce the idea of federalizing, the Republic. While being questioned by the Japanese correspondent about the project of the new constitution, Mircea Snegur clarified that people have the right to choose their own future and that the new constitution has to be based on

democratic law in which human rights will prevail regardless of nationality. The president claimed during the interview that the idea which was invoked by Japanese newspaper correspondent that the problem of unification or non-unification with Romania could be raised. "The goal of the leadership of Romania and Moldova is to reach profound relations between those two states", said President Snegur also clarifying that a top level meeting between authorities from Chisinau and Bucharest is planned for May which will improve economic and cultural relations between those two states.

Snegur Cites Difficulties in Transition to Market Economy

LD2504184393 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1220 GMT 25 Apr 93

[Text] Chisinau, 25 Apr (MOLDOVA-PRESS-TASS)—The fact that Moldova has no definite national concept for a transition to a market economy has led to a precipitation of a decrease in industrial output, deterioration of the agroindustrial complex, and a reduction of investment in major construction projects, Moldovan President Mircea Snegur said at a scientific conference at the Academy of Economic Knowledge.

According to him, Moldova did not manage to overcome a tendency for a strained social-economic situation against a general background of a swift increase of prices and inflation, the pauperization of the population, and an increase in migration. The president was sorry to note the continuing destruction of industrial, scientific, and technological foundations created as a result of the efforts of a whole generation.

Mircea Snegur proposed certain measures that he believed could be used to overcome the economic crisis: first of all, the president believes that it is necessary to drop the concept of state non-intervention in the economy, placing hopes only on market mechanisms; choosing and determining priority reform targets and supporting them through differentiated policies of credits, taxes, and external economic activity. Mircea Snegur has also proposed designing specific programs aimed at stabilizing the situation in the republican industry and to reestablish traditional links with partners from the former USSR, as well as to accelerate the process of privatization and destatification.

General Lebed Sees 'Stabilizing' Role for 14th Army

AU2304164693 Chisinau BASAPRESS in English 1950 GMT 22 Apr 93

[Text] Chisinau BASAPRESS, 22/4/1993—A political decision concerning withdrawal of the 14th Army was adopted but the problem is that we have no alternative place to deploy it to, declared General Aleksandr Lebed in his interview released to the newspaper "MOLDOVA SUVERANA." We remain in the Dniester region for two reasons: to stabilize the social and political situation and to create normal conditions for the withdrawal of the

Army" said in addition General Lebed. Being asked whether the 14th Army played an important role in stabilizing the political situation on the left bank of the River Dniester General Lebed stated that the role of the Russian Army was reduced to military preparation and provision of social conditions for its officers. Referring to Moldova as an integral state General Lebed said that he was taught to evade answers to some questions and expressed that this problem overlaps with the "general will of the Moldovan people and concerns the opinion of national minorities." In the interview released on the occasion of his meeting in Tiraspol with the Association of Women from Moldova, General Lebed expressed hope that the representatives of this Association were convinced that he was not a monster as he was described in some publications from Chisinau. "In my turn I'm convinced that women from the right bank of Dniester don't bite," declared General Lebed.

'Reliable Sources' Say Lebed To Leave

AU2804140593 Chisinau BASAPRESS in English 1855 GMT 28 Apr 93

[Text] Tiraspol BASAPRESS, 27/4/1993—From our special correspondent: Some reliable sources inform that in the course of the next few days General Aleksandr Lebed will leave his office as Commander of the 14th Army.

In conformity with the recent order of the Russian Ministry of Defense, General Lebed and his family will be transferred to Moscow. The Union of Women for the Defense of Dniester, headed by Svetlana Migulea, who is under the direction of the Dniester authorities, is today going to organize a meeting of protest in front of the Office of the Tiraspol Soviet.

Meeting Protests Commander's Possible Withdrawal

AU2904102093 Chisinau BASAPRESS in English 1945 GMT 28 Apr 93

[Text] Tiraspol, BASAPRESS 28/4/1993—From our special correspondent: Today, in Tiraspol, the meeting of protest, started yesterday night in connection to the possibility of the Commander of the 14th Army General Lebed being discharged, continued. The meeting is organized by the Union of Women for the Defence of Dniester headed by Svetlana Migulea and by the Union of Veterans of Afghanistan conducted by Sergey Kulic. Beginning from yesterday evening the total number of participants varied from 100 to 200 people. The participants of the meeting protests against the withdrawal of General Lebed from the post of the Commander of the 14th Army. The participants also demand the resignation of the Minister of Interior of the self-proclaimed Dniester Republic. Yuriy Ovsenikov, the Minister of Security Vladimir Sevto Antufeyev and of the Prosecutor Boris Lucik. Currently those three dignitaries had addressed a letter to the Government of Russia in which they blamed Lebed "of interfering in the internal affairs

of the Moldovan Dniester Republic." Lebed incriminated those people and other leaders in Dniester of having contacts with the local Mafia and of corruption. Military Prosecution Commission from Russia which left Tiraspol to investigate this case, supported the allegations addressed to General Lebed.

Military Commander Discusses Prospect of National Army

AU2404174593 Chisinau BASAPRESS in English
2020 GMT 23 Apr 93

[Text] Chisinau, BASAPRESS, 23/4/1993—Before we begin to create a national army it is necessary to answer the following political question: Does Moldova need this army, and another question of an economic nature: Can Moldova afford to have this army, states Vitaliy Zavgorodniy, the adjunct of the military commander of Moldova and deputy of Parliament, in his interview released for the weekly "MOLODIOY MOLDOVIY". If the army is necessary as a guarantee of stability then it will be sufficient to have one regiment, claims Zavgorodniy. "Today it is impossible to estimate an adequate level of defense. In order to organize it, we will proceed from the premises of the conventional enemy", indicates the second in command. Moldova can afford to have an army which could even be an aggressive one. In all cases, stated Colonel Zavgorodniy, we must first of all create the conditions for reorienting and retraining officers. From a quantitative point of view, indicates Zavgorodniy, an army which is 3-4 times greater than the planned one could be completed but physical preparation of recruits is not sufficient. At present there was a demand to raise the requirements for physical fitness and to reduce the number of ill recruits who are admitted to the army. Colonel Zavgorodniy expressed that the army will benefit if it recruits teenager of 20 years of age and reduces the term of service to 1 year on the basis of a contract system. In this event the technical experts could sign contracts for a minimum of three years or longer according to their wishes.

Departing Romanian Envoy Meets Foreign Minister

AU2804140193 Chisinau BASAPRESS in English
1855 GMT 28 Apr 93

[Text] Chisinau BASAPRESS, 27/4/1993—Today, Nicolae Tiu, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Moldova, received Ion Bistreanu, the ad-interim Charge d'Affairs of Romania in Chisinau, on the occasion of completing his diplomatic mission in Moldova, states a communique of the Mass Media Board of the Ministry of

Foreign Affairs. During the meeting, they discussed bilateral relations between Romania and the Republic of Moldova and expressed their hope that these relations will obtain new and relevant solutions. Tiu thanked Ion Bistreanu for his efforts towards approaching and achieving better understanding between those two Romanian states and also wished him success in his diplomatic career, states the communique of the Board of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Concludes Mission, Makes Statement

AU2804135793 Chisinau BASAPRESS in English
1855 GMT 27 Apr 93

[Text] Chisinau BASAPRESS, 27/4/1993—"I consider that I have completed my mission in Moldova on the measure in which they realize on both banks of the Prut River that economic integration [with Romania], the consolidation of our cultural and spiritual space, and understanding that we undoubtedly belong to the same nation are not just simple declarations but constantly and permanently have the concrete cover", declared Ion Bistreanu, the Charge d'Affairs from Romania in Chisinau, to a BASAPRESS correspondent on the occasion of completing his diplomatic mission in the Republic of Moldova. While being questioned about his attitude, as a Romanian diplomat who will represent the diplomatic interests of Romania in Kiev regarding the problems of Romanians from the South of Bessarabia and Cernauti, Bistreanu answered: "Romanians who are beyond the actual borders of Romania have the right to preserve their own identity, language and its development, culture and history. Like any other Romanian, I consider that I have the moral obligation to offer respect for such rights without being divorced from the harsh realities of the modern world." Referring to the Dniester conflict, Bistreanu expressed that: "I am fed by the hope that the situation in Dniester will be resolved in a peaceful way based on acknowledging the strict territorial integrity of Moldova, legality, rights of national minorities, and protection from all foreign aggression. Concerning this problem we affirm once again our intentions to use all political and diplomatic means." To the question, whether he, as an ambassador in Kiev, has any personal aim to accelerate the resolution of the conflict, Bistreanu replied that concerning this problem there cannot exist any personal aim. "The four-party mechanism had not been liquidated, none of the parties had officially announced, that this mechanism had ended. If the Russian Federation refuses to participate and will officially declare the end of its participation, then I see no reason why this mechanism cannot be based on three parties; I have no doubt that the final decision will favor Moldova," concluded Bistreanu.

Azerbaijan**Deputies Blame Elchibey for 'Political Mistakes' in Karabakh**

NC2804151093 Baku TURAN in Azeri 1351 GMT 28 Apr 93

[Text] Baku, 28 Apr (TURAN)—For the second day now the closed session of the National Assembly is debating the issue of the occupation of Kelbadzharskiy Rayon.

According to available information, the situation is extremely tense at [word indistinct]. TURAN has learned that several deputies blamed the president and the people around him for the political mistakes that resulted in the occupation of Kelbadzharskiy and Lachinskiy Rayons. Considering the situation, they suggested debating the question of removing the president. They also called for an extraordinary session of the Supreme Soviet, but this was rejected.

According to unconfirmed reports, a group of deputies decided to hold an extraordinary session of the Supreme Soviet on 31 April in the absence of the parliamentary chairman.

Yeltsin's Karabakh Envoy Arrives in Baku

NC2904071893 Baku ASSA-IRADA in English 0422 GMT 29 Apr 93

[Text] Baku, 29 Apr (ASSA-IRADA)—V. Kazimirov Yeltsin's special representative for Karabakh problem, arrived in Baku yesterday night, reliable sources told ASSA-IRADA. He met with Asim Mollazade, special representative of the Azerbaijan president. They had an exchange of opinion on mediatory role of Russia in solution of the Armenian-Azeri conflict. A meeting between V. Kazimirov and state secretary P. Guseynov is expected to take place. No official documents are expected to be signed.

Panakh Guseynov Appointed Prime Minister

NC2904102093 Baku AZERTAC in English 0937 GMT 29 Apr 93

[Text] Baku, 29 Apr (AZERTAC)—Thirty six year old Panakh Guseynov, who has held a position of state secretary about half a year, was appointed to the post of prime-minister of the Republic of Azerbaijan at the National Assembly meeting yesterday.

The new premier, who is one of the leaders of the Popular Front, is in favour of economic reform. Mr. Guseynov advocates the creation of the temporal power state based on the principles of democracy. Prime minister is married and has three children.

Killing of Rear Admiral Said 'Politically Motivated'

NC2804144993 Baku TURAN in Azeri 1351 GMT 28 Apr 93

[Text] Baku, 28 Apr (TURAN)—Y. Guseynov, rear admiral and commander of the Naval Cadet School, was shot in the back of the head and killed in front of his house at 1930 on 26 April.

Investigators say there are signs the killing was premeditated. The crime is believed to be politically motivated. Guseynov worked hard to create the Caspian fleet and drew up serious plans to train national naval cadres.

Georgia**Shevardnadze, Sigua Hold Talks With Sukhumi Officials**

LD2804211193 Tbilisi Radio Tbilisi Network in Georgian 1500 GMT 28 Apr 93

[Text] According to the CONTACT INFORMATION AGENCY today, at 1400 [1000 GMT] Eduard Shevardnadze, the chairman of the Georgian parliament and head of state, left for Sukhumi. He was accompanied by Georgian Prime Minister Tengiz Sigua.

Arriving at Sukhumi airport, they were met by the command of the Georgian army formations stationed in Abkhazia, the town authorities, and the leadership of the Abkhazian council of ministers. Shevardnadze and Sigua then headed directly to the Council of Ministers. A meeting is being held there at present.

Government Forms Abkhazian Defense Council

LD2904085293 Tbilisi Radio Tbilisi Network in Georgian 0400 GMT 29 Apr 93

[Text] On 28 April, Eduard Shevardnadze, chairman of the Georgian parliament and head of state, and Prime Minister Tengiz Sigua arrived in Sukhumi. Immediately after their arrival, they went to the council of ministers of Abkhazia, where an extended session was held; it was chaired by Eduard Shevardnadze.

It has been reported from Sukhumi that at the session the defense council of Abkhazia was established, the creation of which had been backed by the Georgian parliament on 27 April.

The council consists of nine persons. Tamaz Nadareishvili, chairman of the council of ministers of the autonomous republic of Abkhazia, was appointed chairman. The members of the council are: Army corps commanders Valeriy Kvaraia, Geno Adamia, Zaur Uchadze; Ramaz Sichinava, deputy chairman of the council of ministers of Abkhazia; Mourice Marshania, chairman of the salvation committee of Abkhazia [title as heard]; Iuriy Keshelava, head of the security service;

Sukhumi Mayor Guram Gabiskiria; and Abkhazian Interior Minister David Rurua.

This was reported by the CONTACT news agency.

Abkhazia Leader Nadareishvili Views Current Situation

LD2804234793 Tbilisi Radio Tbilisi Network in Georgian 1300 GMT 28 Apr 93

[Interview with Tamaz Nadareishvili, chairman of Abkhazia Council of Ministers, by correspondent Rusudan Oniani; place and date not given—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Nadareishvili] It does not matter whether Yeltsin wins or loses, hardly anything will change. Russia has its own policy, its own interests in Georgia, and an individual does not matter much. Whoever the individual is, the policy remains the same.

The pilot that bombs Sukhumi or gets the intelligence data does so undoubtedly because he is paid money. According to our data, every simple flight over Sukhumi costs 150 rubles [as heard]. [passage omitted]

[Oniani] [passage omitted] It is said that the Georgians are forced to sell their houses in the area controlled by the Abkhazian side. How can this problem be tackled? Will all of them have the status of refugees?

[Nadareishvili] When a decision was taken to withdraw the Georgians from that territory, I was against it then and I am against it now. If we state that we are not able to reclaim that territory, and we are looking for another way out, then, of course, we have to save people. At the same time, we are doing what the Abkhazian side wanted us to do. We are clearing out of that area. We are withdrawing our Georgians from there and are ceding the territory. Ardzinba has always talked about it. But if we have no power and possibility to reclaim the territories, then, of course, we must withdraw the people. However, I think we can do that. On the contrary, in the nearest future, the military must plan an operation, carry out it successfully, and we will help those people by our getting there and not their coming here. [passage omitted] [Correspondent] What should be done to reclaim the territory?

[Nadareishvili] I am absolutely sure that military operations can be carried out and in the first stage the town of Tkvarcheli and the Ochamchira rayon will be liberated. [passage omitted]

Threatens To Resign

NC2804140593 Yerevan SNARK in English 1328 GMT 28 Apr 93

[Text] Tbilisi, April 28 (SNARK)—Speaking to the Georgian parliament the Abkhazian Prime [Minister] Tamaz Nadareishvili has threatened to resign if the Georgian leadership doesn't pay the attention at the

situation existing in Abkhazia. Nadareishvili has characterized the situation as the catastrophe. No military discipline in the Georgian forces, the moral level of the personal content is too low. No possibility to solve the Georgian-Abkhazian conflict using only peaceful means. He is of the opinion that some Georgian leaders aren't interested to put an end to the war. That's why no measures are being taken to crush the Gudauta group.

Russian General Blames Ardzinba for Failed Sukhumi Attack

LD2804220793 Tbilisi Radio Tbilisi Network in Georgian 1500 GMT 28 Apr 93

[Text] General Sorokin [commander of the Russian troops in Abkhazia] thoroughly worked out the possibility of massive bombing of Georgian military positions by artillery, aviation, and heavy equipment on 15 April. After that, the Abkhazians should have occupied Sukhumi. As is known, this plan has failed. According to some witnesses, the infuriated General Sorokin searched for [Chairman of the Abkhaz Supreme Soviet Vladislav] Ardzinba, cursing him in a temper. In Sorokin's words the Abkhazians failed to complete the attack on Sukhumi thus causing the death of many fighters. That is what worried General Sorokin.

At present, many Abkhazians consider Ardzinba as the first enemy of his own people, since his maniacal arrogance has sacrificed the lives of many people. The present war results in bringing the Abkhazians to the brink of extinction. They make up only 15 percent of the Armed Forces and the extremist leaders are forced to recruit 13-year-old and 14-year-old boys who are specially trained in the boarding school in Gantiadi.

The current situation greatly influences the mood of some prominent Abkhazians. Their stand changes. A statement by Ivane Lakerbaya, head of the Gudauta Elders' Council, serves as a good example of this. He said that Ardzinba has lost the trust and loyalty of his supporters.

This information was reported by the CONTACT information agency.

Military Command Denies Moving Units To Aid Kitovani

LD2804212293 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1900 GMT 28 Apr 93

[Text] Today, the Georgian military command in Abkhazia refuted today's report by the Abkhaz side on the Mkhedrioni military formations being transferred to Tbilisi to support Tengiz Kitovani in his struggle for power. The press center of the Georgian Armed Forces has stated that this information is not correct, and it is the latest attempt by Abkhaz separatists to destabilize the situation in the republic.

Shevardnadze Receives RSA Ambassador, Praises New Relations

LD2804202193 Tbilisi Radio Tbilisi Network in Georgian 1500 GMT 28 Apr 93

[Text] The establishment of diplomatic relations between Georgia and the RSA has been described by Eduard Shevardnadze, the chairman of the parliament and head of state, as an important event in the life of the country. He stated this on 28 April, at a meeting with Mr. Deon van Schoor, the South African ambassador to Ukraine, who is visiting Tbilisi. Having voiced assurance that the relations between the two countries will develop for the prosperity of their people, Mr. Eduard

Shevardnadze emphasized that the Georgian government has a keen interest in the development of comprehensive contacts with the RSA.

The ambassador, on behalf of his government, told the head of the Georgian state that he fully supports the efforts directed toward putting into practice democratic reforms in Georgia and regulating the country's internal problems. Mr. van Schoor stressed that the RSA recognizes the territorial integrity of Georgia, its sovereignty and the inviolability of its borders. The ambassador said: As an ambassador to Ukraine, I am honored to be able to establish diplomatic relations with Georgia on behalf of my country. By this, the government of the RSA displays a special attitude toward Georgia and Ukraine. From now on we can hold a direct political, economic, and cultural dialogue.

Estonia

Official Says Russian Army Adding to Border Control Problems

WS2904085493 Tallinn ETA NEWS RELEASE in English 1713 GMT 28 Apr 93

[Text] Tallinn, April 28—An advisor to Estonia's Ministry of the Interior, Juri Ruus, returned from a Stockholm conference on uncontrolled migration over the Baltic Sea on Wednesday.

Ruus told the conference that Estonia has major border control problems at its eastern border as Russia has refused to recognize Estonia's border with Russia set by the 1920 Tartu Peace Treaty. Consequently, Estonia must perform border control at a provisional administrative border.

Ruus also said that Estonia has a 600,000-strong foreign community brought into the country during the Soviet-time Russification. An additional 50,000 illegal residents and a majority of resigned Russian army officers have also stayed in Estonia.

The Russian military do not speed up their departure and hold unpermitted military training in Estonia, he added.

Until problems harming Estonia's security are solved the country cannot sign the United Nations refugee convention, Ruus said.

Russian Signals Intelligence Station Continues Operations

PM2804150293 Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 25 Apr 93 p A7

[Mert Kubu report: "Russian Signals Intelligence Activities Annoy Estonians"]

[Text] Tallinn—Just outside Tallinn there is still a sophisticated Russian signals intelligence station manned by GRU, the Russian military intelligence service, and the KGB. From the station it is possible to eavesdrop on all broadcast communications up to a range of 5,000 kilometers—and this includes Sweden, Estonian Defense Minister Hain Rebas told DAGENS NYHETER.

He showed pictures taken secretly inside the eavesdropping station by Estonian security men. Rebas wants to close the station. But there are certain difficulties. It turns out that during Edgar Savisaar's time as prime minister the government strangely enough gave the Russians permission to continue their signals intelligence operations. The agreement is confirmed in a protocol between the two sides.

The present Estonian Government has instructed Defense Minister Rebas to investigate how the operations can be stopped.

"It is also of great interest to Sweden that the eavesdropping should be stopped," Rebas said.

An effective jamming station is too expensive for the Estonians to buy. As a result Estonia has nothing against borrowing one from the Swedish defense forces.

Another alternative is that the Estonians should simply locate the electricity cables that go to the installation and cut off the electricity. However, there are reserve generators. But during the shutdown part of the installation's computer system could be destroyed.

Monitoring station S/O 1053 is in Juri municipality on the road that passes the airport in Tallinn on the way to Tartu.

This was the Estonian Defense Ministry intelligence service's report to Defense Minister Rebas:

"Concerning the shared installation run by the army intelligence service and the KGB located on the road to Tartu. It is a gigantic installation. A little way from the main building there are additional antennas and around 800-1,000 meters further away there are other buildings with a forest of antennas. The installation's purpose is global strategic signals intelligence in a range of between 300 and 5,000 kilometers."

It is possible for the installation to eavesdrop on all telephone conversations and all radio telephone conversations to and from Estonia, according to the information gathered by the Estonian Defense Ministry.

"When one of our men was there they showed him how easy it is to tap into conversations. 'What do you want to listen to? You only have to say,' the installation's personnel said," Rebas reported.

With the Estonian defense minister as chaperone we traveled out to locate the monitoring station, which is hidden in a forest grove. It is surrounded by a high fence. The entrance is barred. No people are to be seen outside.

"But they guard the installation around the clock with five or six men from GRU and the KGB in each shift," Rebas said.

As the crow flies the distance from the installation to Stockholm is no more than 400 kilometers. As a result it is fully possible to monitor what is going on on Swedish territory, said Rebas, himself a reserve captain in Sweden's signals troops.

Lithuania

Foreign Minister Comments on Policy Issues, Envoy to U.S.

LD2804194893 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1700 GMT 28 Apr 93

[Text] Lithuanian Foreign Minister Povilas Gylys held a press conference in the Seimas Palace today. This was

attended by Justas Paleckis, foreign policy adviser to the Lithuanian president. He read a statement by Lithuanian President Algirdas Brazauskas on the results of the referendum in Russia, in which he expressed his joy at the success of Russian President Boris Yeltsin and at new possibilities for cooperation.

Povilas Gylys commented on his visit to Copenhagen where he took part in a conference on the prospects of development in East and Central Europe and in a meeting of the foreign ministers of three states of the European Community and of the Baltic states. It was stressed at these meetings that the developed European countries should render more help to the post-communist countries in integrating into the European community. According to Povilas Gylys, it was felt at the meeting of the foreign ministers of the three states of the European Community and of the Baltic states that the aspirations of the Baltic states were understood and supported.

Povilas Gylys emphasized that the Lithuanian ship of foreign policy is sailing and its course— independence—has not changed. Foreign policy is forming and changing, the world is changing, but the main stance remains the same, said Povilas Gylys.

Asked to comment on a question by the opposition concerning Ambassador to the United States Stasys Lozoraitis, Povilas Gylys explained that he has proposed that he become Lithuania's ambassador to Italy. According to Povilas Gylys, so far the contacts between the embassy in the United States and Lithuania have been insufficient, therefore it has been decided to appoint to the post of the ambassador a person from the Lithuanian community in the United States and to recruit more people from Lithuania. Povilas Gylys denied that a candidate for the post of ambassador is a son of Seimas member Kazys Bobelis. The Lithuanian Foreign Ministry yesterday received a reply from Stasys Lozoraitis which, according to the minister, is not very clear.

Brazauskas Welcomes Yeltsin Referendum Victory

LD2804202093 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in English 1900 GMT 28 Apr 93

[Text] Commenting on the results of Russia's national referendum held last Sunday, President Brazauskas said that the attempt of Russian extremists to reinstall the Bolshevik rule in Moscow had failed. In his official statement on this issue Mr. Brazauskas expressed satisfaction that the majority of Russian citizens said yes to President Yeltsin's reforms.

The Republic of Lithuania, as Russia's friendly neighboring country, welcomes the success caused by President Boris Yeltsin, reads the statement. We are happy that this expression of the free will of Russian citizens will provide for new possibilities to develop democracy and strengthen political stability in the country as well as

to expand cooperation between our two states, writes Mr. Brazauskas in his statement.

Russian Military Experts Arrive for Troop Withdrawal Talks

LD2804213693 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in English 1900 GMT 28 Apr 93

[Text] A group of military experts from the Russian Defense Ministry has arrived in Lithuania to discuss the coordination of the Russian troop withdrawal. The Russian side expressed belief that the pullout process would not be slowed down because of political reasons.

However, according to Russian experts, Lithuania should assist Russia in removing her servicemen and military equipment since the Russian officers are faced with lack of housing in Russia and transportation difficulties in Lithuania.

It was reported that Russian Defense Minister, Pavel Grachev, is expected to come to Lithuania in the nearest future.

Experts Coordinating Troop Withdrawal

WS2904080293 Tallinn BNS in English 1759 GMT 28 Apr 93

[Text] Vilnius, Apr 28, BNS—A group of military experts from the Russian Ministry of Defense started working to coordinate troop withdrawal from Lithuania in Vilnius Tuesday.

The Russian experts met with Colonel Stasys Knezys, government commissioner for Russian army withdrawal and head of the Lithuanian army headquarters.

The meeting was devoted to technical questions of the continuing pull out, the social and political situation of Russian officers in Lithuania and preparations for the Russian defense minister's visit to Lithuania, scheduled for mid-May.

The withdrawal will not be delayed for any political reasons, the experts said. In an interview with Lithuanian TV they noted that the units deployed in Lithuania have many "organizational" problems - the equipment is dismantled, depots and registration of military property are disorganized.

A majority of Russian units lack enough soldiers for loading and other work. The experts said Lithuania should offer help to solve these problems.

Lithuania allowed Russia to bring in an additional 300 Russian soldiers in April to assist the withdrawal.

The experts said they are prepared to speed up the solution of all problems and, if necessary, to remain in Lithuania until the pull out is completed.

Knezys told Lithuanian TV that the military experts of both countries will also focus on problems of handing over military installations, primarily - military enterprises and airports.

The Russian group meets with Defense Minister Audrius Butkevicius Wednesday.

Fights, 'Misunderstandings' Reported on Polish Border

LD2804233993 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1700 GMT 28 Apr 93

[Text] PAP has published information on misunderstandings on the Lithuanian-Polish border. It says that fights and other misunderstanding often take place among those waiting in line on both sides of the border.

On the Polish side they are less frequent because the lines there are shorter, a PAP correspondent was told by a representative of the border protection in Baltstoge, Włodzinierz Zilinski. He said that on 25 April nine Polish citizens, including one woman, were beaten up on the Lithuanian side. They were protesting that cars were being allowed to cross the border without forming a line. Lithuanians used wooden bats to beat them. The event was passively observed by the Lithuanian police. [words indistinct] that information about the fight has been sent to the commander of the Lithuanian border troops.

According to a Polish-Lithuanian agreement on the joint border control, Lithuania is obliged to ensure order on its side. On 6 March the Lithuanian antiterrorist brigade "Aras" attempted force Polish customs officials to allow trucks carrying alcohol and cigarettes to enter Poland. They were threatening with their weapons and disorganized the work of the border service. The corresponding Lithuanian services have been informed about this.

The Sunday incident, PAP reports, is the second serious incident on the border in recent (?months).

Landowners' Union Criticizes LDLP Agrarian Reform

WS2904093593 Vilnius LIETUVOS AIDAS in Lithuanian 16 Apr 93 No. 71 p 7

[Article by Edvardas Raugas, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian Landowners' Union Council, under the "Discussion" rubric: "Reform or Anti-Reform?"]

[Text] The construction of the power pyramid is over in Lithuania. It was all very easy, because so many workers and reinforced concrete constructions were left from the former unfinished bright palace. There have been other proposals as well—to build a European home together with the whole nation and the Lithuanians in emigration. However, the LDLP [Lithuanian Democratic Labor Party] does not listen to outsiders' suggestions.

Let us go back to definite tasks. What will the new government do for the people and land? The Leninist

slogan: "Land To Those Who Work It!" has remained. It is unclear whether former party secretaries are among those who till the land. I wish they would give up this slogan. Lenin was an open adversary of farmers and landowners. He deprived them of their property and deported and executed them, because they interfered with the construction of the communism castle designed by him. The LDLP seems to have renounced those utopias. Why then should they resort to hackneyed slogans? The same holds true for private ownership. As soon as Lithuania's political ship tilted to the left, the LDLP immediately began to propagate collective property. If some people miss this collective or cooperative property so much or cannot live without it, they are free to bring their wealth together and own it jointly. However, does this require amending the Lithuanian Constitution?

Winter has passed, but we do not see any definite work. Instead, the top officials grieve and shed many tears over the ruined agriculture. If we really want to do justice, we should say that Lithuanian agriculture has been destroyed since the 1940 occupation. By the way, the Nazi conquerors were in no hurry to annul or repeal the things that the "People's Seimas" had expropriated. During the German occupation, only a few hundred documents on land ownership were issued annually. Other people had to prove that they could till the land. There were some German colonists as well. Thus, the refusal to acknowledge land ownership and restore land is a feature of both brown and red occupiers. After the German occupation, land was distributed to landless peasants and small landholders. Then, it was again taken away, collectivized, and devastated by industrialization. Some people who accomplished collectivization are now Seimas deputies. It is them who are so furiously demanding that the authors of the current reform be tried for ruining the agriculture. What will we do then about the former destroyers who ravaged the countryside and the spirit of its people? They proclaim, for example, such nonsense that the current reform equals collectivization. It is very strange that top officials, ministers, and some Seimas deputies see the agrarian collapse only through torn farm roofs and starving cattle. Nothing has collapsed in the areas where the local authorities have remained conscientious. Thus, the key reason is not reform itself, but local petty bosses and the people whom the previous "reform" has spiritually drained.

The amendments prepared by the Seimas Agrarian Committee and the Government program propose building a Lithuania of plot-holders and small collective farms. Most such farms are doomed to bankruptcy, because prices for fuel, facilities, and other resources will go up. What is better—to distribute everything before something is left unstolen, or to let people decide for themselves after going bankrupt? If we take the current course proposed by the Seimas and the Government, we will be compelled to begin a new reform in one or two years. Where is the proclaimed competence of the LDLP members if they do not look a few years down the road? There

are some definite proposals to speed up reform by employing land banks, mortgages, land notary publics, and issuing every landowner a certificate on his property right. There would be enough time for people to make up their minds. This may be real support and the only way out of poverty for pensioners and the unemployed. Rural people and companies could begin planning their lives

and production after concluding agreements with real owners and not with officials who change constantly. This is no secret, but the experience of East Germany that could be partially applied here. However, it is much easier to make speeches and look for the guilty and the enemies. That is why they may not be able of seeing any other way except yesterday's course.